2505

ASIATIC AFFINITIES

THE OLD ITALIANS.

ROBERT ELLIS, B.D.,

FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, AND AUTHOR OF "ANCIENT
ROUTES BETWEEN ITALY AND GAUL."

"Tuscos Asia sibi vindicat."

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

CHAPTER II.

CHAPTER III.

CHAPTER IV.

CHAPTER V.

ERRATA.

In p. 15, l. 17; p. 16, l. 1; and p. 18, l. 24; for Mœsia read Mœsia.
In p. 94, l. 4; for *sulthn* read *salthn*.
In p. 102, l. 27; for *mataram* read *mataram̄*.

PREFACE.

THE publication of the great work of Fabretti, the
Corpus Inscriptionum Italicarum, has rendered avail-
able a rich store of materials for investigating the
affinities of the ancient languages of Italy. The addi-
tional Etruscan epitaphs, in particular, are of the
highest importance, and have induced me to return
once more to the subject of the Etruscan language;
for it does not appear, at least to my knowledge, that
all the results to which the new inscriptions lead have
hitherto been deduced from them. What the signifi-
cance of those results is may be estimated from the
facts, that we are now in possession of the written
forms of several Etruscan numerals, that we are enabled
to recognise the Etruscan equivalents for the Latin
-ginta and *-genti,* and that, in addition to the pre-
viously known *ril,* "year," we may likewise elicit
the Etruscan words for "month" and "day."

The objects which I have chiefly had in view in the
following pages are: to demonstrate the Armenian
character of the Etruscan language in as complete and
brief a manner as possible, and to present such a
vocabulary of Etruscan words as may be sufficient for
the interpretation of the common forms of expression
on the monuments of Etruria. It would increase the
interest with which those relics of an ancient nation

are regarded, if the meaning of the inscriptions which they bear could be understood, and we were thus qualified to know what the Etruscans engraved upon their offerings to the gods, and on the tombs of their dead. At the same time, these votive and sepulchral forms, when combined with the Inscription of Cervetri, and with such other points of evidence as may conveniently be introduced in connexion with these three bodies of proof, seem quite sufficient to disclose the nature of the language of the Etruscans, and thus to determine who that enigmatical people really were.

But the origin of the Etruscans is a question that does not stand alone, and that cannot be treated without touching on several others which relate to ancient and prehistoric times. To one of these in particular I have endeavoured to direct inquiry. As the Armenians, the last representatives of the old Thracian race at the present day, have been neglected or overlooked in all investigations relating to the affinities of the Etruscans; so too a similar extension, in remote ages, of the race of nations now confined to the Caucasian regions, is a probability that has not been sufficiently allowed for in constructing the population of Europe before the Aryans entered it. There seems, as far as I can judge, to be no necessity for inferring the extinction of either of the two ancient stocks mentioned eighteen years ago by Dr. Latham in the following passage, which sets forth very clearly and forcibly the two principal questions whose solution I have attempted :—

"The displacements effected by the different Euro-

pean populations, ono with another, havo been enor-
mous. See how tho Saxons overran England, tho
Romans Spain and Gaul. How do we know that ·
somo small stock was not annihilated horo ? History,
it may be said, tells us the contrary. From history
wo learn that all the ancient Spauiards were allicd to
tho ancestors of tho Basques, all Gaul to thoso of tho
Bretons, all England to those of the Welsh. Granted.
*But what does history tell us about Bavaria, Styria,
the Valley of the Po,* or *ancient Thrace ?* In all theso
parts the present population is known to be reccut,
and the older known next to not at all. Tho rocon-
struction of tho original populations of such areas as
theso is ono of tho highest problems in ethnology.
To what did they belong, *an existing stock more
widely extended than now,* or a fresh stock altogethcr?"

" My own belief is, that the number of European
stocks for which thero is an amount of evidence suffi-
cient to make their extinction a reasonablo doctrino is
two—two and no moro ; and even with these the doc-
trine of their extinction is only *reasonable.*"

" *a.* Tho old Etruscans are the first of theso";

" *b.* Tho Pelasgi tho second."

If the Etruscans were of the samo raco as the
Armenians, and the Pelasgi of tho samo race as the
Caucasians, both theso stocks would still survive. The
Caucasian tribes include tho Georgians (with the
Lazians and Mingrolians), who are counected through
tho Suanians with tho Circassians and Abkhasians ;
tho Ossotes, who aro frequnently supposcd to be Aryans;
tho Kisti, who are connected through tho Tusehi and

Pschawi with the Georgians; and the Lesgi in the
ancient Albania. The langnages of these tribes differ
very considerably, but something common is found to
run through them all.

The following eqnivalents will be employed for the
Armenian alphabet; and the Greek lotters which corre-
spond to the Armenian in place, though not always in
sound, are prefixed to them :—

a. *a.*
β. *b.*
γ. *g.*
δ. *d.*
ε. *e* (*e* or *ye*).
ζ. *z* (English *z*).
η. *ê.*
  ẽ (*e* mute).
θ. *th* (Hebrow *teth*).
  ź (French *j*).
ι. *i.*
  l.
  kh (guttural).
  ẓ (*ds*).
κ. *k.*
  h.
  ż (*ts*).
λ. *t* (Welsh *ll* : Polish *t*).
  ǵ (*dź* : English *j*).

μ. *m.*
  y.
ν. *n.*
ξ. *ś* (English *sh*).
ο. *o.*
  č (*tś* : English *ch*).
π. *p.*
  ÿ (*dś*: as *sch* in *mensch*).
ρ. *r* (strong *r*).
σ. *s.*
  w (strong *v*).
τ. *t.*
  r.
  ẓ (*tz* : Hebrew *tzaddi*).
υ. *v.*
φ. *ph* (like *p'h*).
χ. *ch* (Hebrow *koph*).
ω. *ó* (broad *o*, or *au*).
  f (used in foreign words).

ARMENIAN DIPHTHONGS.

av, the older form of *ó.*
ev, liko English *yew.*
iv, vowel *y,* French *u.*

ov, vowel *u,* English *oo.*
ow, long *o.*
ea, like French *è.*

The Armenian alphabet was invented about 1500
years ago.

THE ASIATIC AFFINITIES OF THE OLD ITALIANS.

CHAPTER I.

Migrations of the Aryans from their original home in Mount Imaus.—Route of the Thracians into Europe.—Western and Northern limits of the Thracian area in Europe.—With what nations the Thracian race came into collision.—Primitive population of the South of Europe, and of Asia Minor and Armenia.

As the Asiatic element in Italy was mainly Etruscan, and the Aryan character of the Etruscan language will be apparent as soon as its examination is commenced, such an examination may be appropriately preceded by a sketch of the probable course of the Etruscans from the original home of the Aryan family of nations, and by an endeavour to determine what were the elements which composed the early population of the South of Europe.

A remarkable light has been thrown on the first movements of the Aryans by the researches of German scholars, the result of which is readily accessible in the third volume of Bunsen's *Egypt's Place in Universal History*. But the map which is there given as illustrating the "track of the Aryans from the Primeval Country to India," might perhaps receive with more

jastice the title of "a map to illustrate the tracks of
the *Southern* Aryans from the Primeval Conntry to
India and *Armenia*." Tho "Primeval Country" was the
mountainous region which contains the sonrces of tho
Oxus and the Jaxartes: and the map exhibits clearly
how tho Aryans, starting from this country, settled
successively in Sogdiana, Margiana, Bactria, Parthia,
Aria, and other tracts, until the list of tho districts
which they occupied in tho earliest times concludes at
last with these threo conntries:—

14. Varena, new *Ghilan*, S.W. of tho Caspian.

15. Hapta-Hindu, now the *Punjab*.

16. "The sixteenth country has no specific name.
Its inhabitants are the dwellers *near the sea-coast, who
do not require any ramparts*. Their curses are *winter*
and *earthquakes*. As the *Caspian* was the sea nearest
to tho Old Iranians, we must understand the shores
of that sea."

It seoms a highly probablo inference that this last
country was Armenia, which formerly tonched *Ghilan*
and the *Caspian Sea*,* is protected by the natural
ramparts of its mountains, has a long and severe
winter on account of its olevated position, and is
notoriously sabject to *earthquakes*.† But, even with-

---

* See tho map in Whiston's *Moses Choronensis*.

† "In tho summer of 1840 Armenia was visited by a violent
earthquake, which shook Ararat to its foundation. The immense
quantities of loose stones, snow, ice, and mud, then precipitated
from the great chasm, immediately overwhelmed and destroyed
the monastery of St. James and the village of Arghuri, and spread
destruction far and wide in the plain of the Araxes. Althongh

ont this inference, the mention of Ghilan immediately
hefore the Pnnjab, and the positions of tho other
thirteen regions previonsly named, weuld lead up to
the following conclnsion :—

The Southern Aryans, proceeding from the banks
of the Oxus, and expanding as they advanced, reached
Armenia on the west about tho same time as they
occupied the Pnnjab on the east, and hefore they
entered Sonthern Media, Persia, Carmania, Gedrosia,
and India beyond tho Sutlcj.

Whatever may be the historical value of these
results thns deduced from the Vêndidâd, they fall in
at any rate singularly woll with the theory which I
desire to snpport, and which may be stated in this
manner:—

Tho Southern Aryans were ultimately divided into
three principal stocks: the Thracian on tho west, the
Medo-Persjan in the centre, and the Indian on the
east.   The Thracian raco, as a distinct member of the
South Aryan family, had its origin iu Armenia, about
the same time, and in the same manner, as the Indian
race had its origin in the Pnnjab.   Finally, while the
Medo-Persians were gaining possession of the southern
half of Iran, npon the Indian Ocean and the Persian

Ararat is formed of volcanic rocks, yet no allnsion to its volcanic
activity at auy period, no mention of an eruption, is made by any
of the native historians, who record, nevertheless, several earth-
quakes more or less calamitous."   Appendix to Cooley's transla-
tion of Parrot's *Journey to Ararat*, p. 371.   The earthquako of
1840 was felt as far as Tiflis, 150 miles N. of Ararat, and as Tauria
or Tabreez, 150 miles S.E. of Ararat, near Ghilan.

Gulf, and while the Indians were carrying the Sanskrit language with them from the Indus to the Bay of Bengal, *the Thracians were extending themselves from the Caspian to the Alps and the Tyrrhenian Sea, and carrying an Armenian dialect into Etruria and Rhœtia.*

That there were Thracians over all this extent of country is, however, not merely a probable or possible conjecture: it is a matter of ancient history, or at least of ancient tradition. What the earliest Zoroastrian record seems to exhibit in the germ, the authors of Greece and Rome present in its completion. Twenty-two such authors, as Mr. Dennis has noticed, derive the Etruscans from the Lydians; a presumption of affinity not to be hastily set aside, although the voyage of the Lydians to Etruria under the conduct of Tyrrhenus may be no more historical than the voyage of Æneas, and Tyrrhenus himself a personage like Hellen and Romulus, or Delphinus and Sabaudus, the sons of Allobrox. That some Alpine nations, and especially the Rhætians, were akin to the Etruscans, is a fact attested by Livy: and that the Lydians and Carians were allied in blood and language to the Mysians, who were a branch of the Thracian race, is affirmed by other writers. There were too, as we learn from Strabo, Thracians mixed with the Celtic inhabitants of Noricum and Pannonia, the countries which intervene between Rhætia and Dacia. The rest of the historical argument for the extension of the Thracians from Armenia to Italy may be summed up in the words of Dr. Latham, although he has rejected the result which

I not only accept, hut extend to Etruria :* "Tho old Thracian affinities aro difficult, hut not beyond investigation. A series of statements on the part of good classical authors tell us, that the Daci wero what the Getæ were, and the Thracians what the Getæ; also, that the Phrygians spoko the samo langnago as the Thracians, and tho Armenians as the Phrygians. If so, either the ancieut language of Hungary must have heen spoken as far as the Caspiau, *or the ancient Armenian as far as the Theiss*." Write here *the Alpine Rhino and the Tiber* for *the Theiss*, and I believe that no more than the truth would bo said, and perhaps not quite as much as the whole truth. For I imagino that the Bohryces, whom several authors mention in tho Eastern Pyrences, wero Thracian sottlers who came thither by sea, prohahly from Italy, before the Carthaginians and Greeks formed settlements upon that lino of coast. My reasons for this coujecture may bo thus briefly expressed, as a part of tho cumulative proof of the western exteusion of the Thracian race:—

Armenian ...
$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\textit{sarn,} \text{ "ice :" root } \textit{sar,} \text{ "freeze."}\\ \textit{patel,} \text{ "to onclose" (th. } \textit{pat).}\\ \textit{patovar,} \text{ "wall, rampart."}\end{array}\right.$

Bithynia.......*Patavium,* a town of the Thracian *Bebryces.*

Pannonia......*Patavium,* a town, now *Pettau.*

---

* *Ethnology of Europe,* p. 229 (1852). Dr. Latham considers that two languages were spoken in Phrygia; one allied to that of the Armenians, and the other to that of the Thracians, whom he regards as Slavonic.

Venetia . . . . *Patavium*, tho chief town, now *Padua*.*

E. Pyrenees . . . *Bebryces*.†

Pyrenees . . . . . . *sern-eille*, " glacier." For the termination, compare *ab-eille*, *sor-ella*, and *or-illa*. The rest is Armenian. Observe, too, that *Iberians* bordered on theso Bebryces, and on the Armenians.

Patavium, tho chief town of Venetia, seems to have a Thracian and Armenian name. Of the Venetian langaage I know only one word, which is given by Pliny (*II. N.*, xxvi, 6) : "*Halus* aotem, qnam Galli sio vocant, Veneti *cotonoam*." *Cotonea* " comfrey, σύμ-φυτον, *wallwurz*," may bo explained, liko tho Dacian κοτίατα, "ἄγρωστις, gramen," from tho Armenian *khot*, " herb, forage," an Armenian word which nearly replaces the English *wort* and the German *wurz* in names of herbs. Tho Armonian *khotan*, "low, *humilis*," shows a connexion in senso botween *khot* and *humus*. Ptolemy mentions an Armenian town called Κόταινα. The *Cot-ensii* were a Dacian tribe.

Tho Bebryces in Roussillon, with tho word *sern-eille*, "glacier," would mark the extreme western extension of the Thracians. On the north-west their limit wonld havo been Rhætia, where their presence is indicated by several Rhæto-Romance words used in tho Swiss Canton of tho Grisons. The following group

<hr/>

* These three *Patavia*, and no others, are mentioned by Ptolemy.

† See Bouquet, *Historiens de la France*, vol. i, pp. 94, 114, 531, 677.

of five kindred terms may mark how the Southern Aryans once reached from the Ganges to the sources of the Rhine, while the existence in Lydian of the termination of the Armenian present participle, *-avt*, *ót*, or *ot*, is one sign that the Lydians had a more intimate degree of affinity with the Armenians than with the Indians. The Etruscan language, when we come to examine it, will exhibit exactly the same degrees of affinity to the Armenian and the Sanskrit that the ancient Lydian and Rhætian appear to have possessed. These are the five words :—

Sanskrit......... *kaṇṭha*, " the throat, the throttle."

Armenian........ *khetdavt*, " throttling, choking."

Lydian .... κανδαύλ-ης, " σκυλλοπνίκτης, the quinsy."*

Albanian .... *kyendis*, " I choke."†

Rhæto-Romance.. *candarials*, " a choking disease."‡

The following Rhæto-Romance names of animals exhibit also Armenian affinities :—

Guis, " marten."   Armenian *kovz*, " pole-cat ;" *kznachis*, " marten," = Polish and Bohemian *kuna*, Russian *kuniza*, Lithuanian *kiaune*.

Asöl, asoula, "kid." Armenian *ayz*, "goat" (= Sanskrit *agá*, Greek *αἴξ*); *ovl*, "kid."

Turna, " moth."   } Armenian *thithern*,
Fafarinna, " butterfly." }   " butterfly."

---

* Bötticher's *Arica*, p. 44.   † Hahn's *Albanesische Studien*.
‡ "Eine Art Drüsenübel, das das Athmen sehr erschwert."
Carisch's *Rhäto-Romanisches Wörterbuch*.

Salipp, "locust." Sanskrit *çalabha*, "locnst:" root *çal*, "to run." Armenian *satap*, "quick, gliding."

There are thus signs of the Armenian language having once stretched as far as the Pyrenees and the Alps: and the same may be said of the Carpathians, for the relics of the Dacian language exhibit some striking instances of Armenian affinity. These relics consist of more than thirty names of plants used in medicine;* names that are very likely to contain the Dacian equivalents for the German *kraut* and *wurz*, and the English *grass*, *wort*, or *weed*, which are the terms that most commonly enter into the composition of German and English names of plants. The corresponding terms in Armenian are: *khot*, "herb, verdure, hay," and *det*, "herb, medicine, poison." Thus "tobacco" is *zkhakhot*, "smoke-herb," and "rhubarb" is *khasndet*, "flock-wort," in Armenian. Are there any indications of kindred words in Dacian?

Now ἄγρωστις, *gramen*, was called in Dacian κοτ-ίατα or κοτ-ήατα, in which we may fairly recognise the Armenian *khot*, "herb, hay;" while it is very probable that a word similar to the Armenian *det*, "herb, medicine, poison," existed in the Dacian διέλ-εια or διέλ-λεινα, "henbane;" τευ-διλά or τευ-δειλά, "calamint;" δουω-δηλά, "origan;" πρια-δήλα or πρια-διλά, "black briony;" κοικο-διλά (or possibly κυκο-λίδα), "nightshade;" and perhaps προπε-δουλά or προπε-διλά "cinquefoil." In addition to *khot*, the Armenian has

---

* Grimm, *Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache*, cc. 9, 30.

another word for " grass," *séz*, apparently = Sanskrit *çáka*, "herba." This word, combined perhaps with the Armenian *anyaǵ*, " unlucky, detrimental," may be found in the Dacian *ἀνιασσεξέ*, " onobrychís :" Pliny (xxiv, 113) speaks of a plant called *impia herba*. There is too in Armenian the word *ost*, "ramus, germen, palmites, frondes" (cf. Basque *ost*, "leaf," and German *ast*), which, when combined with the Armenian *zow*, " θάλασσα," gives a good explanation of the Dacian *ζουόστη*, "artemisia," of which Dioscorides says that it grows for the most part *ἐν παραθαλασσίοις τόποις*. There is a fifth Armenian word of the same class as *khot*, *det*, *séz*, and *ost*, which are all apparently found in Dacian. This word is *phthith*, "the blowing of a flower," which gives the verb *phthëth-il*, " to blow, to bud, to sprout," with the present participle *phthëth-ot*, the preterite participle *phthëth-eal*, and the future participle *phthëth-eli*. We meet likewise with *phthith*, when combined with *zatik*, " flower," *mist*, "always," and *loys*, "light," in the following compounds :—

　　zatk-a-phthith, " flowering, blooming."

　　mëst-a-phthith, " ever-blooming."

　　lovs-a-phthith, " luminous, light-shedding."

To these add one of the previous Armenian *l* terminations, or such a one as in *ovś-et*, " sensible," from *ovś*, " sense," and then compare the Dacian—

　　φιθ-ο-φθεθελά, " ἀδίαντον, maidenhair."*

---

* Φιθ- is perhaps to be found in the Armenian *phet-ovr*, "feather."

It has been pointed out by Grimm that one Dacian word, κρουστάνη, "χελιδόνιον μέγα," is the Lithuanian *kregźdyne*, and that another, δύν, "nrtica, κνῖδη," is the Welsh *dan-ad*. The existence of such words in Dacian may, however, be accounted for by contiguity of position; an expedient which cannot be admitted as an explanation of the Armenian affinities of the Dacian, which are, besides, more numerous and intimate than any other. There were Celts in Pannonia, and there may have been Lithuanians in Galicia; but Armenia is far away from Hungary and Wallachia.

Having now ascertained, by the combined aid of history and language, the probable limits of the Thracian area in Europe, we must proceed to consider another subject before entering upon the examination of the Etruscan language. What nations possessed the area in question when the Thracians first intruded upon it?

I spoke of Bunsen's map (*ante*, p. 2) as illustrating the tracks of the *Southern* Aryans to India and Armenia; for it is hardly probable that all the Aryans entered Europe through Armenia and Asia Minor. If the "Primeval Country" of the Aryans was the region where the Oxus and the Jaxartes have their sources, then another branch of that race, who may be called the Northern Aryans, would most likely take their way into the West along the north of the great barrier of sea and mountain, a thousand miles in

---

and *phet-tel*, "to pluck." Φιθοφθεθελδ would then be "feather-sprouting, plumy," just as the Armenian *lovsaphthith* is "light-sprouting, luminous."

length, which is formed by the Caspian, the Caucasus, and the Euxine. The leaders of this division seem to have been the nations of the Classical stock, such as the Umbrians, the Oscans, and the Hellenes; which last I think, with Dr. Latham, to have been maritime settlers from Italy, as the Pelasgians and the Leleges may have come from Asia. I should find the explanation of *Pelasgi*, who are described as *veteres*, as αὐτόχθονες, as ἀρχαιότατοι, and as ἀρχαῖον τι φῦλον, in the Armenian words, *wat azg*, "ἀρχαῖον φῦλον;" where *azg* is "race, nation," and *wat* is "ancient, old," = Greek παλ-αιός, = Epirot πέλ-ιος. *Pelasgi* would be a Thracian term corresponding to the Greek *Auto-chthones* and the Latin *Aborigines*. Armenian words similar to *Pelasgus* in formation are: *lavazgi*, "noble," = *good-race; watazgi*, "plebeian," = *bad-race; azatazyi*, "citizen," = *free-race; aylazgi*, "foreigner," = *other-race*; and some more. *Leleges*, "again," is readily explained as "sailors," from the Armenian *let, lot, lovt*, "swim," *lotak* or *lovtak*, "swimmer;" *nava-lovtak*, "navigating."* The Classical nations would probably, as might be expected from the level nature

---

* "The *headlands* of Southern Greece, and some other parts of the *coast*, were occupied in the earliest times by the *Leleges* and other tribes, *which spread themselves from the opposite shores of Asia Minor over the islands of the Ægean Sea*. But, with these exceptions, the whole continent, from the borders of Thrace and Macedonia to the extreme point of Peloponnesus, was peopled by the great Pelasgian nation" (Malden). If the Leleges came by sea into Greece, and the Bebryces by sea into Roussillon, the Tyrrhenians *might* have come by sea into Etruria.

of their supposed route from the Oxus to the Danube, reach Italy before the Thracians, while the reverse may have been the case in Greece; and they would have been followed or accompanied into Europe by their kindred the Celts, till the Alps, or perhaps the Carpathians, severed the stream into a northern and a southern arm. The Celts, in their turn, would have been followed by the Germans, and the Germans finally by the Slavonians and Lithuanians; although it is possible that these two ramifications of the Sarmatian branch of the Aryan stock, whose languages have several Armenian affinities, may have preceded the Thracians through Asia Minor. I do not, however, think so myself. If the Thracians entered Europe from Asia Minor, and the Celts through the South of Russia, it might be anticipated that the two races would clash and mingle on the Lower Danube; and this would account, not only for what Celtic may appear in Dacian, but also for such Celtic words as the Etruscan has taken up.

But other tongues, besides the Celtic or any other Aryan language, may have affected the original Thracian as it was carried from Armenia to Etruria. Europe would have been peopled by some other nations before the Aryans entered it. Now, if we eliminate from Europe, together with that part of Asia which lies between the Caspian and Ægean Seas, all Aryan, Semitic, and Turkish inhabitants, we shall be left with only three races, or groups of nations: the Basques in the west, the Fins in the north, and the

nations of the Caucasus in the east. The first approximation therefore that we should make towards reconstructing the primitive population of Europe (with Armenia and Asia Minor) would be, by extending the Basques, the Fins, and the Caucasians, till they met somewhere in the centre of Europe. I do not, however, find any linguistic signs of a Basque population there, though the Taurine *asia*, "rye," has been compared with the Basque *acià*, "seed;" and the name of the Taurine *Iria*, now Voghera, is like the Basque *iria* or *uria*, "city." But I must notice three Alpine words which deserve attention as possible indications of an extension of Fins and Caucasians into those mountains. The Ossetes and Tuschi, it has been mentioned in the preface, are two Caucasian tribes; and the *Tuschi* would apparently be a remnant of those *Tusci* whom Ptolemy speaks of in Asiatic Sarmatia on the north slope of the Caucasus. It might be an extension of the same race that brought the *Tuscan* name into Europe, where we meet with it in Etruria. The three Alpine words are:—

1. *Käss, kees, käse*, "glacier" (Noric Alps).* Lapponic *kaisse*, "mons altior, plerumque nive tectus." Esthonian *kahho*, "frost; *kasse jäu (jäa*, "ice"), "ice formed by frost upon snow." Georgian *qiswa*, "frost."†

2. *Laui, lauwi, lawine*, "avalanche."‡ Tuschi *law*, "snow" (Schiefner's *Thusch-Sprache*).

---

* The Noric Alps lie to the north of the great valley of the Drave, the Carnic Alps to the south.

† Compare the Peruvian *cassa*, "hail." Helps' *Life of Pizarro*.

‡ In Rhæto-Romance, *lavinna*.

3. *Tüssel,* "boy, *knabe*" (Splügen district). Carian
τουσσύλοι, "Πυγμαῖοι." Ossetic *tyüsül,* "little,"
= Armenian *doyzn.* Armenian *thzovk,* "a pygmy;"
root *thiz,* "a span." Κάτ-τουζα, πόλις Θράκης, ἐν ᾗ
κατῴκουν οἱ Πυγμαῖοι.*

The last of these three words may possibly be
Aryan, and have been carried into Rhætia by the
Thracians; but of the other two, one seems Caucasian,
and the other both Finnish and Caucasian. There
would be two explanations of the presence in the Alps
of Turanian words for "ice" and "snow," if it may be
allowable to apply the title "Turanian" to the Fins
and Caucasiana. Such·words may have been taken up
in Asia by the Thracians, and have been brought by
them to Rhætia; or they may be due to an original
Turanian population extending from the Ural or the
Caucasus to the Alps. If we adopt, as I should be
inclined to do, the second of these alternatives, we
might be led to inquire if there were any European
nations in historic times who belonged to this primi-
tive Turanian population. That the Basques or Iberians
formed a part of it is no improbable supposition; and
I suspect that both they, and all the original inhabit-
ants of the South of Europe, as well as of Asia Minor
and Armenia, were allied in blood and language to the
Caucasian nations, while the North of Europe, beyond
the Alps and the Carpathians, would have been Fin-
nish.† The identity of names is remarkable. Not

* Bötticher's *Arica,* p. 5.

† "The population of the first period," says Mr. Troyon, in his

merely were there *Iberians* and *Tuscans* in the Caucasus
as well as in Spain and Italy; but the name of the
nation which intervened in Europe between the Iberians
and Tuscans, namely, the *Ligyes* or *Ligurians*, is found
likewise in or near the Caucasus, as we know from
Herodotus and Zonaras. There were, too, *Ligyrii* in
Thrace, and the Taurisci of Noricum here the additional
name of *Ligyrisci*. The Ligurians of Italy were almost
extirpated in their long war with the Romans (Niebuhr),
and both in Italy and Gaul they would have been
much Celticised, as we know that the Salyes were;
while the Tuscans of Italy, if originally Caucasian,
would have been conquered by the Thracian Rasenæ,
and have lost their national existence, while they
communicated, like the Britons, their name to their
conquerors. The same lot probably befell the primi-
tive population of Dacia and Mæsia; for, though the
Dacian language was Thracian in the time of Diosco-
rides, as may be inferred from its Armenian affinities,
and as Strabo had declared at a rather earlier period,
yet the Dacian town-name *dava*, of which a few

work on the Swiss Lake-dwellers, "are a primitive people, per-
haps belonging to a Finnish or Iberian race which came out of
Asia several thousand (hundred) years before our era, and follow-
ing the course of the Rhone or the Rhine wandered into the
valleys of the Alps." Keller's *Lake Dwellings* (Eng. trans.), p. 395.
I imagine that *law-ine* and *kees* are relics of the language of this
Finnish or Iberian race, using *Iberian* in the double sense of
Georgian (or Caucasian) and Basque; like as the ancient presence
of the Thracian Bebryces in Roussillon would be indicated by the
word *sern-eille*, "glacier," in the Pyrenees.

instances are found in Mæsia besides, with one in
Dalmatia, and one in Dardania, seems best explained
from the Georgian *daba*, "village, town," though
probably allied at the same time to the Sanskrit *deça*
and the Armenian *deh*, "pagus." A parallel might be
made with Cornwall, where Celtic place-names exist
among a people now speaking English. The *Daci* or
Davi were probably "the villagers," as Gesenius has
interpreted the name of the Caspian *Dahœ* or *Dai*.*

---

* The Georgian *daba* might also explain the name of the Gala-
tian *Tavium*, and the last part of *Pa(t)-tavium* (*ante*, p. 5), while
Pat- was referred to the Armenian *pat-el*, "to enclose." There was
a Dacian town called *Patav-issa*. Two more Dacian towns were
called *Acidava*, which bears a resemblance to *Acilavones*, the
second name of the Centrones in Savoy. We know that there
were the pile-towns of an early race on the Leman Lake—

"Quam vetus mos Græciæ
Vocitavit *Accion*."   (AVIENUS)

Guadix in Andalusia was anciently called *Acci*. In Georgian, *vake*
is "plain, fields," like the Spanish *vega*. In Lapponic, *wagge* is
"valley:" "*imprimis vallis inter montes latior*," which would well
describe the position of the Ligurian *Vagienni*. The Genoese
lalla, "aunt," seems Finnish too, as *lel* is "uncle" in Esthonian. We
find in Avienus the inhabitants of the Alpine valley of the
Rhone called *Tylangii*, *Daliterni*, *Chabilci*, and *Temenici*, instead of
Viberi, *Seduni*, *Veragri*, and *Nantuates*; just as the *Acilavones* were
also *Centrones*, and as the *Medulli* were also *Garoceli*. Each one of
the six tribes between the Furca and the Mont Cenis had two
names, and so likewise had the *Lacus Lemanus*. The Alps were
perhaps not much Celticised before the movement which brought
the Gauls into Italy. The *Chabilci* seem to have left their name
to *Chable* and the *Chablais*, which once included the Lower Vallais.
There was a town called *Chabala* in the Caucasian Albania.
Temnus was a mountain in Mysia.

A part of the *Albanians*, the probable representatives of the ancient Illyrians, are still called *Toscans;* and both are Cancasian names, though the Albanian language is Aryan, as Bopp has shewn in his essay on that subject. Among many remarkable Albanian words, two may be selected on account of their significance. One of them, *diel* or *dil*, "sun," resembles the Georgian *dili* or *dila*, "morning," but would also be allied in root to the Albanian *di(tē)*, "day," = Latin *dies*, = Sanskrit *di(na)*, = Welsh *dyw*, = Armenian *tiv*. The Armenian plural form, *tich*, "ago," i. e. "days," would imply *ti* in the singular as another form of *tiv*. The Sanskrit *diva*, "heaven," is likewise a kindred term; and the root is the Sanskrit *div*, "to shine." By taking this root into the Armenian, dropping the *v* as in the Sanskrit *dina = divana*, and adding one of the Armenian *l* terminations (*ante*, p. 9), the Albanian *diel* or *dil*, "sun," comes to mean "shining, bright." Yet *l* terminations are as characteristic of Georgian as they are of Armenian and Etruscan; and *dili* or *dila*, "morning," is a true Georgian derivative from the root, *di(v)*, "to shine." In Tuschi, too, "God" is *Dal*, which might be deduced from a similar root.

For from the root *div* the Sanskrit derives also *deva*, "God," = Armenian *dev*, "demon;" which words, when combined with the Armenian *werin*, "high" (shortened into *wern* in *wern-akan*, "celestial"), lead us at once to the Albanian *perndi* or *perēndi*, "God." The root of *werin* is the Armenian *wer*, "on high" (= Sanskrit *para*, "altus"), which gives in the

c

comparative *weragoyn,* "superior," and enables us to explain the Phrygian βερεκύνδαι, "δαίμονες," i. e. "the supreme spirits;" or else as "the most high," if δ is not radical. *Berecynthus* was also a mountain.*

The Armenian for "God" is *astovaż,* = Zend *aҫtvat,* "existentia *(aҫtu)* præditus."†

The Etruscan words for "Deity" are Aryan, like the Armenian and Albanian. They are, according to Classic reporters, *æsar,* "deus," and *αἰσοί,* "θεοί." *Aes-* or *ais-* is the Old Norse *ás,* "deus," the Armenian *ays,* "spirit, demon," and probably also the Gaelic *aos,* "fire, the sun," from which by the addition of *fear,* "bonus, *vir,*" = Sanskrit *vara,* Armenian *ayr,* are derived the Gaelic *Aosar,* and the Irish *Aosar, Aesar,* "God," which Bopp compares with the Sanskrit *iҫvara,* "dominus," and *iҫ,* "dominari." The connexion between "dominus" and "sol" is shown in the Sanskrit *ina,* "dominus," = Irish *ion,* "sol." Yet we should expect the Sanskrit *iҫ* to become *ic (= ik)* in Gaelic. The Etruscan for "heaven," *falandum,* would be allied to the Persian *buland,* "high, heaven," and the Sanskrit *olaṇd,* "in altum tollere."

Whatever the population may have been originally in Illyria, Dacia, and Mæsia, yet it seems eventually to have been either Aryan or Aryanised, as it would certainly have been in Thrace and Greece: but among the mountains in the heart of the peninsula a remnant of the original Turanian inhabitants may have been

---

* Other languages present signs of affinity here. See Diefenbach, *Lex. Comp.* s. v. *fairguni,* "berg."

† Bötticher's *Arica,* p. 63.

left in the Pæonians, with the dwellers on piles whom
Herodotus describes on Lake Prasias ; the kindred,
perhaps, of the Swiss lake-dwellers who have of late
excited general interest, and whom "Realmah" has
made so popularly known. The Pæonians represented
themselves, according to Herodotus, as a colony of the
Teucrians from Troy, and their remains were certainly
called *Gergythes* (v. 22), and probably dwelt at *Gergis*,
Gergithium, or *Gergithus*, in the territory of Lampsacus
(Strabo, p. 589). *Gergeti* is an Ossetic town in the
centre of the Caucasus. The pile-dwellers on Lake
Prasias cut their timber in Mount *Orbelus*, and the
Orbelians were a princely family in Georgia.*

If there were people of Caucasian origin in Europe,
it is not likely that Asia Minor would be without
them. The most eminent nation here that I should be
inclined to consider as Turanian and Caucasian would
be the Lycians, whose language, which is neither ·
Aryan nor Semitic in character, appears to me to
present signs of such an affinity. I have discussed the
question at some length in my *Armenian Origin of the
Etruscans*, and shall only select a very few points for
notice here. The Lycian term for "wife," *lade*, de-
serves consideration in the first place, and may be
thus derived from the Caucasian by the aid of the
Circassian and Lesgi languages :—

$$
\text{Circassian} \quad \dots \begin{cases} \left.\begin{array}{l} lay \\ l'lay \end{array}\right\} \text{"flesh."} \\ \left.\begin{array}{l} lay \\ t'hlay \end{array}\right\} \text{"blood."} \\ tlay, \text{"husband."} \end{cases}
$$

* St. Martin, *Mémoires sur l'Arménie*.

Lesgi ....*tly'adi* } " wife."
Lycian ....*lade* }

Three other Lycian words are :—

　　　　tedê-eme, " son."
　　　　κάδρ-εμα, " σίτου φρυγμός."
　　　　ΰλ-αμος, " καρπός."

the last pair being two of the five Lycian words
derived from Greek reporters. The terminations of
these three words may be fonnd in the termination of
the Esthonian infinitive *-ma*, which resembles the
Turkish infinitive terminations, *-mak, -mek*; or in the
Tuschi noun-termination *-om*, which is, however, not
common; or in the Lapponic noun-termination *-em*,
which is exceedingly frequent : as, e. g.—*passat-et*,
"lavare," *passat-em*, "lotio ;"—*passot-et*, "colere,"
passot-em, "cultus;" *pass-et*, "assare," *pass-em*, "vern."
But Aryan languages have similar terminations, as in
ἄν-εμος.

For *ΰλ-αμος* we have—

　　　　Turkish *él-ma* } " apple."
　　　　Hungarian *al-ma* }

and for *ΰλ-* —

　　　　Esthonian *willi* } " fruit."
　　　　Tuschi *chil* }

　　　　Georgian { *khili*, " apple."
　　　　　　　　{ *th-khili*, " nut."

for *κάδρ-* —

　　　　Tuschi *kotor*, " cake, bread."

and for *tedê-* —

　　　　Esthonian *toid-* } " nourish."
　　　　Armenian *taz-* }
　　　　Greek *τήθη*, " nurse."

I subjoin one Lycian epitaph to show the language,
and because it will enable me to explain a word
better than I did on a former occasion :—

éwuinu	*gorû*	*mute*	*prinafatû*	*ésédéplume*	*urppe*
this	tomb	here	made	Esedeplume	for

lade	*éuwe*	*sé*	*tedésaeme*	*éuweyé*	*woméleyé.*
wife	his	and	children	his	all.

For the last word compare :—

Tuschi
$\begin{cases} \text{wune.........} \text{``some, } was, welches.\text{''} \\ \text{wun—}ele \text{ ...``every, } jedes.\text{''} \\ wum \text{ ....``something, } etwas.\text{''} \\ \text{wuma ......``all, } alles, alle.\text{''} \end{cases}$

Lycian ...*wom—éle—yé*, " all."

On a gold collar about six inches in diameter,
which is now in the Museum of Vienna, and was
found in Wallachia, a part of ancient Dacia, in the
year 1838 (Micali, *Mon. Ined.*, tav. LIII), there is an
inscription written from left to right, which may be
read by the aid of the Lycian characters, *alufiithdi
iifipfa*, "the *iifipfa* of Alufiithûs," a name partially
like *Alyattes.** Here the short *a* is X, which is
Lycian ; and the *u*, I surmounted by X, which is also
Lycian. If the X be made a χ or *ch* instead of a short
a, the inscription would become *chlufiithdi iifipfch,*
which seems a less likely reading. The remaining
letters in the inscription have nothing particularly
distinctive about them. If the collar were a votive
offering, or even a gift to an individual, *iifipfa* might

---

* Pausanias (x, 16) says, that of all the offerings of the Lydian
kings nothing remained at Delphi but the iron pedestal or base
of the bowl of Alyattes.

be explained from the Tuschi *iphob* = Georgian *iephoba*, "generosity, munificence, *freigebigkeit*;" which coneists of the Tuschi *iaph*, = Georgian *iephi*, "munificent," combined with the Tuschi termination *-ob* = Georgian *-oba*. Votive offerings are said to bo given *libenter* and *libera munere*. Such a Georgian form as *saso-eba*, "hope," comes still nearer to *iif-ipfa*, though *-ipfa* should likewise bo compared with the Sanskrit *çal-abha*, = Armenian *sat-ap*, = Rhæto-Romance *sal-ipp* (*ante*, p. 8).* We have seen from the Dacian *-dava*, = Georgian *daba*, "village, town," that the language of Dacia was probably at first Caucasian, and from the Dacian names of plants that it became afterwards Thracian; as the language of Gaul became Latin while the Celtic town-names were retained in the country. Yet it does not follow, because the gold collar was found in Dacia, either that its original destination was Dacia, or that the inscription on it is Dacian. It might have been carried off, and brought to Dacia. For the declension of *Alufiithai*, compare the Tuschi *Markai*, tho genitive of *Mark*, "Marcus;" and *maśai*, the genitive of *maśa*, "lux," = Sanskrit *mâs*, "luna," = Georgian *mze*, "sol."

Micali thinks tho characters on tho Wallachian collar to bo like the Euganean letters. The Euganeans may very well have been a remnant of the early Turanians of Italy. They were neither Gauls nor Venetians.

---

* Compare *apfel*, *hüpfen*, *kopf*, and *apple*, *hop*, *cop*.

Malden writes, in his unfinished, and hardly commenced, *History of Rome:* "The mountainous country northward from the lake (of Garda) remained in possession of the Euganei. Of this ancient and once powerful people Cato was still able to enumerate thirty-four towns (Plin. *II. N.* iii, 24) ; and they were reported by tradition to have inhabited all the country between the Alps and the Adriatic Sea, till they were driven into the mountains by the Veneti (Liv. i, 1). Their chief tribe was the Stoni or Stœni (Plin. *H. N.* iii, 24), and the Stœni are expressly named Ligurians in a fragment of the Triumphal Fasti, and by the geographer Stephanus." I think it probable that the Euganeans are rightly connected with the Ligurians, as well as the Orobii, whose origin Cato could not ascertain (Plin. *H. N.* iii, 23). The same mystery hangs over the origin of the Euganeans. Micali says (vol. ii, p. 25): "Vanamente però vorremmo rintracciare l'origine degli Euganei." No doubt it is difficult to do so. Indeed, until Caucasians or Fins be brought in, there is always one race at least, in Italy, in the Torkish peninsula, and in Asia Minor, which cannot be accounted for. The name of the *Orobii*, who occupied the mountains of Como, and possessed *Berg-omum* (which is like *Perg-amus*, and may contain a termination like the Tuschi -*om* and that of the Lycian ὑλ-αμος) ; of the river *Orobis*, now the *Orb* in Langnedoc ; of the river *Orba* in the Ligurian Apennines; of the Pæonian Mount *Orbelus ;* and of the Georgian *Orbelian* family ; —all these names may be compared with three given

by Ptolemy: *Orbanassa* in Pisidia, and *Orbisene* and *Orbalissene* in Armenia Minor, where *-sene* would be the Armenian termination *śén*, found in *meẓaśén*, "great," and *śikaśén*, "red." Cf. Tyr-*senus* and Por-*sena*. It signifies also "town," and is Georgian as well as Armenian. *Orbi* means "eagle" in Georgian, and *-ali* and *-eli*, which may appear in Orb-*elus* and Orb-*alissene*, are common Georgian terminations: e. g. dab-*ali*, "humilis," from *dab*-a, "pagus;" Guri-*eli*, "belonging to the country of Garia." *Mount Orbelus* would probably = *Adlersberg*, but the rivers *Orba* and *Orobis* would rather mean "swift," like as the Etruscan *aracus*, "hawk," is the Armenian *arag*, "swift." Cf. *Araxes*. There is an *Arbel-horn* in the Bernese Alps.

The Tuschi call their own country *Baźa* (Schiefner, s. v.); a name resembling the Hispanian *Basti*, now *Baza*, which Humboldt compares with the Basque *baso(a)*, "forest." The *Bessi* were a Thracian tribe.

There was an ancient people in Paphlagonia or Bithynia called *Caucones*, who were extinct in Strabo's time. Some thought them to be Scythians, others Macedonians, and others Pelasgians. A people of the same name were once found in Messenia and Elis. The *Cauco-ensii* were a Dacian tribe. Cf. *Caucasus*.

In addition to the Lycians, I should be inclined to consider as Caucasian the Pisidians and Lycaonians, neither of whom are mentioned as Thracians, though the Phrygians and Milyans, who bordered on them, are expressly said to be so. *Lycaon* was a son of *Pelasgus*. When the Thracians advanced from the

Caspian into Armenia and Asia Minor, I think that they left the relics of the primitive Caucasian population, on their right in Armenia, and on their left in Asia Minor. Upon the whole, I may define the position which I imagine the Caucasians held with respect to the Thracians, both in Asia and Europe, by comparing it to that which the Dravidas now hold with respect to the Sanskrit nations in India. The Cappadocians or White Syrians, who divided the Armenians from their kindred, the Phrygians, would have been Semitic invaders from the south at a later period, whom an infusion of Thracian and Caucasian blood may have rendered fairer in complexion than the rest of the Aramæans. As the Thracians proceeded from Asia towards the west, their language, previously liable to be affected with Caucasian and Semitic elements, would probably have taken up some Celtic, and perhaps some Finnish words, especially in Italy and the Eastern Alps. But its substance and its structure would remain Armenian; and such, I believe, the Etruscan language will prove on examination.

CHAPTER II.

ETRUSCAN SEPULCHRAL INSCRIPTIONS.

It has been shewn in the preceding chapter, from the accounts of the ancients, how they made a series of Thracian nations to extend from the Caspian Sea as far as the Carpathians and the sources of the Rhine; and several linguistic coincidences have been brought forward in confirmation of the truth of these accounts, which there does not seem to be any reason for impugning. There is then, as Etruria is included in the Thracian area, a certain antecedent probability that the Etruscan language would be found to belong to the same Aryan family as the Armenian: and we have, besides this, the evidence of Livy, a native of Padua, that the Rhætian language, which appears from its relics to have been like the Armenian, was Etruscan with a corrupt pronunciation. It will accordingly be the object of this and the two following chapters to shew that the Etruscan language was Aryan of the Armenian type; and the argument will be opened by an examination of the Etruscan epitaphs that contain the often cited *avil* and *ril*, words both characterised by one of those *l* terminations to which I have already called attention.

There are three words, *œtas*, *annus*, and *vixit*, which
continually occur in Latin epitaphs, accompanied by
the name and age of the deceased. The case is the
same in Etruscan, where the corresponding words are
avil, *ril*, and *leine*, with *line* elsewhere. To illustrate
the use of these Etruscan words, it will be sufficient to
select the following seven of Lanzi's epitaphs, in each
of which the proper name is omitted, and its place
supplied, for convenience of reference, by the number
of the epitaph :—

453. *avil* XXXIII.	454. *avil ril* LXV.
32. *avils* XXIX.	455. *ril* LIII *leine.*
10. *ril* XXI.	456. *ril leine* LV.
87. *line.*	

There are almost enough materials here to deter-
mine the family of languages to which the Etruscan
belonged, for the respective meanings of *avil*, *ril*, and
leine, are scarcely to be mistaken. I will, however, as
so much is to be learned from these three words
alone, proceed to prove what a careful observer might
very likely perceive on inspection : and this demonstra-
tion seems to be the more requisite, as it was said
long ago, and has not yet entirely ceased to be re-
peated, that all we know of the Etruscan language is,
that *avil ril* means "vixit annos," though it cannot be
said which is the noun, and which the verb.* Even

---

* "Of their language, chiefly preserved to us in their sepulchral
inscriptions, we know absolutely nothing. The only expression
that has been satisfactorily made out is the very common one of
RIL AVIL, 'vixit annos.'" Murray's *Central Italy*, p.256 (ed. 1857).

Niebuhr was at fault here. "Al dire di lui," writes Micali, in his *Antichi Popoli Italiani* (vol. ii, p. 351), "la scienza dell' Etrusco sarebbe ristretta all' interpetrazione *certa* di due sole parole : AVIL RIL, *vixit annos*."

Yet all that can be pronounced certain, or almost certain, is, not that *avil ril* means "vixit annos," but that of the two expressions, *avil ril* and *ril leine*, one signifies "vixit annos," and the other "anno ætatis." *Ril* therefore, which occurs in both expressions, stands for both *anno* and *annos*, and would consequently be the Etruscan word for "year" used without declension, or else contracted to its crude form like *ann.* and *ætat.* in Latin. Again, as *avil* and *avils* cannot both be rendered "vixit," to say nothing of other obvious reasons, it is plain that *avil* is *ætas* or *ætat.*, and that *avils* is *ætatis;* so that *avil* would be declined like an Aryan noun. So far then from its being certain that *avil ril* means "vixit annos," it is easy to see that *avil ril* cannot mean "vixit annos." Finally, as *ril* is "year," and *avil* is "ago," no sense but "lived" is left for the remaining word *leine*, which, when accompanied by the number of years of life, is always joined with *ril*, "years," as *vixit* is with *annos*.* When it stands alone, as *line*

---

* "Occurrit (*leine*) in titulis sepulcralibus (ex Volaterris), conjunctum cum voce *ril*, quod exponitur *annos* vel *annorum*." Fabretti, p. 1042. Should it not therefore have been inferred that *leine* corresponded to "vixit," especially when *avils*, "ætatis," had been rightly interpreted, as it has for some time been in Italy? Of the explanations that have been given for *leine*, the Latin *lene*, i. e. *leniter*, and the Greek λεῖος, are selected as the most probable in Fabretti's vocabulary. But even if *lene* be taken

does twice in Lanzi, the Roman euphemism, " she lived," would be employed for " she is dead."

The Etruscan words, *leine* or *line*, " he lived," *ril*, " year," and *avil*, " age," may be thus explained :—

SANSKRIT.

Root *li*, " adhere, dwell, *live*."
  laya, " house, dwelling."*
  linâti, " he dwells."
  alinât, " he was dwelling."

ARMENIAN.

Root *li*, " become, be, live" (implied in *li-eal*, "been").
  lavray or *lóray*, " dwelling, *home*."
  Lóré or *Lori*, name of two towns, " *Ham*."
  lini, " he is."
  linér, " he was" (imperfect: there is no aorist).

ETRUSCAN.

Lori-um, name of a town.†
leine or *line*, " he lived."

---

as a valediction equivalent to " sit tibi terra levis," and λάιτοs as meaning " tumulus," how can the resulting explanations of *ril leine* LV or *ril* LIII *leine* be more probable than " annos vixit .." ? There is no reason to infer at starting that the Etruscan, Greek, and Latin languages belonged to one family, but rather, as Niebuhr and Micali affirmed, strong grounds for separating the Etruscan from the other two: for the Greek and Latin, after being put to the torture for a century, have given no explanation of the commonest Etruscan forms. Proximity need not imply affinity; and the languages of Etruria and Latium may have been no more nearly allied than are those of England and Wales.

 • Cf. Thracian λίβα, " πόλις." Bötticher's *Arica*, p. 51.

 † *Loro* and *Lari* are two modern towns in Tuscany.

GAELIC.

Root *rà*, " go."

    rà-idh, " a quarter of a year."

SANSKRIT.

Root *ri*, " go."

    ri-tu, " a season (of two months)."

ARMENIAN.

Root *rah*, " go" (implied in *rah-el*, "to go").

    kath-*il*, " to drop, a drop" (root *kath*).

ETRUSCAN.

r-il, " a year." Compare *n-il* = *nih-il*.

SANSKRIT.

Root *av*, " grow, move."

ARMENIAN.

    lin-*il* or lin-el, " to be" (root *li*, base *lin*).

    lin-eli, " that is to be" (future participle).

    av-eli, " exceeding, redundant, more."

    yav-êt, " more, rather."

    yav-itean, " an age."

    av-ag, " more aged, elder."

    tes-*il*, " aspect" (root *tes*).

ETRUSCAN.

    av-il, " age."

The Armenian *av-r*, "day, time, age," and *av-t*, "ring," i. e. " circle, circuit, orbit," might also be akin to *avil* and the Sanskrit *av*: and the following words may he cited to illustrate the connexion hetween " going" and " year," and " season" and " year;" as well as to exhibit still further the relationship of the

Indians to the Armenians, and of both, in their proper
degree, to the reputed ancestors of the Etruscans :—

SANSKRIT.

Root *hi*, " go, increaso, amplify."

hayana, " year."

---

nava, " new."

çarad, " autumn, year ;" whence *çárada*, " new."

ARMENIAN.

Nava-sard, " ancient name of first month :"
zardi, " new."

LYDIAN.

Νέος σάρδις, " New-year."*

.OSSETIO.

särd, " summer."

Something may likewise be said about the forms of
the Armenian words adduced to explain *leine*, *avil*,
and *ril*. The Armenian imperfect is formod like the
imperfect of the Latin *possum*, so that *lin-êr*, " he was
living," corresponds to *pot-erat :* for the Sanskrit
ásît, " he was," = Zend *ás*, = Armenian *ér*, = Latin
erat.† But, in the imperfect, it is only in the third
person singular, and there, it may be, in order to
distinguish *ér*, " he was," from *é*, " he is," that the
Armenian retains the *s* of the Sanskrit root, converted
into *r* as in Latin. In the Armenian *éi*, " I was,"
= Sanskrit *ásam*, and *éir*, " thon wast," = Sanskrit

---

* Bötticher's *Arica*, p. 49. The city *Sardis* might derive its
name from the Armenian *zardi*, "new." Cf. Ebrard on Rev. iii, 1.

† The augment is, however, wanting in *erat*.

ásis, that letter is omitted; so that we should rather
expect in the third person, instead of *linér*, a form
like the Etruscan *leine* or *line*, "he lived," which may,
too, be the Sanskrit (*a*)*lin* (*t*), "he was living," when
the augment is dropped, as in Latin, Zend, and Ar-
menian, and the final *t*, as in Armenian, Greek, and
Italian. But perhaps, as we shall see eventually,
leine is an historic present, = Armenian *lini*, while
line is the imperfect. With respect to *av-il* and *r-il*,
it should be noticed, that *-il* is the usual termination
of the passive or neuter infinitive in Armenian, as in
lin-il (or *lin-el*), "to be." The Etruscan *ril*, "year,"
i. e. "course (of the sun)," would thus signify originally
"das Gehen," = Armenian *ṛahel*, just as the Armenisn
ḳathil signifies "a drop," as well as "to drop:" and
avil, "sge," would in like manner signify "das
Wachsen." The German *leben* is another example of
an infinitive that is also a noun: and it is remarkable
that a single Armenian word *lin-il*, "leben," should
contain the meaning of *leine* or *line*, and the form of
av-il and *r-il*. In the Etruscan *lein-*, too, there is a
double affinity to the Sanskrit and Armenian; for the
conjugational *n* is there, as well as the root *li* or *lí*.

In the Armenian *lavray* or *lóray*, "a home," which
explains the signification of the Armenian *Lori* and
the Etruscan *Lori*-um (*ante*, p. 29), the root of dwelling,
li or *lí*, seems combined with the Sanskrit *vṛi*, "tegere,"
which occurs, with the termination *-an* added, in the
Armenian *vran*, "tent, booth." Compare *Verona*,
the Noric *Virunum*, and the village *Vrin* in the Grisons.

Avil or *avils*, "ætatis," accompanied by the number of years of life, is found in conjunction with two other words besides *ril*. One of these words appears in two forms, *lupu* and *lupuke*, the last being one of those *-ke* forms which are so common in Etruscan, as in *tur-ke* or *turu-ke*, "be gives." In Lanzi we find :—

465. *lupu*.

463. *lupu avil* XXIII.

464. *lupu avils* XVII.

and in Fabretti :—

2100. *avils* XXXVI *lupu*.

2058. *avils* LX *lupuke*.

If *avil ril* corresponds to *anno ætatis*, and *ril leine* to *vixit onnos*, the Latin form to which *lupu avils* corresponds would most likely be *obiit ætatis*. *Lupu* would then mean "ho dies," and be a verb belonging to a *u* conjugation, liko tho Armenian *lizov*, "he licks." The root of *lup-u* is supplied by the Sanskrit *lup*, "destroy;" *lûp*, "kill, rob;" or by the Polish *tup*, "booty;" *tup-ić*, "to plunder;" *tup-ać*, "to split;" or by the Gaelic *lobh*, "putrefy," and the Irish *lubha*, "corpse." All these words are allied to the Sanskrit *lu*, = Greek λύ-ω, and to tho Armenian *lovz-el*, "to loose." We shall meet in another epitaph with *lupum*, which means "corpse" in the accusativo.*

I said it was only *almost* certain that *avil ril* and *ril leine* meant "anno ætatis" and "vixit annos," because it would be possible *a priori* that *lupu avils* meant

---

* The Greek and Latin explanations of *lupu* are λοχδs and *locus*.

"vixit annos," and *ril leine*, "ætatis obiit." The forms
might be sufficient to assure us that, in these four
words, *ril* and *avil* are the two nouns, and *lupu* and
lcine the two verbs. If, therefore, we can deduce, from
the Armenian and Sanskrit, *avil*, " age," *ril*, " year,"
leine, " ho lives," and *lupu*, " he dies," we should have
the right meanings for the four words collectively, and
might fairly conclude that each one of them was cor-
rectly interpreted. Nor would this conclusion be
much, if at all, shaken, because *avil* with a number is
found connected with one more word, as in the follow-
ing epitaph, where the proper name is omitted as
before (*Giorn. Arcad.*, vol. cxix, p. 325) :—

    zilachnke avil S.I. (qu. *avils* . .)

Orioli renders these words conjecturally, "obiit, de-
positus est, sepultus est ('o simile') ætatis —— ;" and
it is not easy to see how a different meaning can be
given to them. As, therefore, the sense "obit"
(= "ohiit") is in all probability anticipated by *lupu*,
zilachnke ought apparently to mean " sepelitur, info-
ditur": and, as the Aryan character of the Etruscan is
sufficiently apparent in the forms already interpreted,
a root found in many Aryan languages would be an
appropriate root for *zilachnke*. Such a root appears in
the Greek λάκος, in the Gaelic *lag*, " cavum, specus,"
in the Italian *lacca*, " fossa, caverna," in the Armenian
ʋtag, " fossa," and in the Phrygian *lachit*, which pro-
bably means " fodit." Assuming, then, *lach* as the
Etruscan for "grave," and "is buried" as the meaning
of *zilachnke*, we might make the following comparisons
between Etruscan and Armenian forms:—

ETRUSCAN.

lach,............... " a grave."

zi—lach ——nk —— e, " he is buried."

‒ ARMENIAN.

akn,............... " an eye."

z—akan————ê, " he eyes."

ett, ... "a place."

z—etet ———— é, " he places."

getin, ... " ground, *terre.*"

z—getn ———— é, " *il terrasse.*"

pholh,............. " a response."

phokh ——— é, " he exchanges."

phokh—anak,... " change, lientenant, vicar."

phokh—anak-é, " he oxchanges, he succeeds."

yatth, ... " great."

yatth ——— é, " he conquers."

yatth—anak, ... " victory."

yatth—anak—é, " he triumphs."

The only discrepancy here is, that the Etruscan *zilachnke* is passive, while the Armenian verbs cited are active ; though *yatthanaké,* " he triumphs," and *phokhanaké,* " he succeeds," i.e. " he puts himself in the place of another," may be considered as reflective. In Armenian, *n* implies " self," and *k* is causative.

Z is prefixed to nonns and pronouns, as well as to verbs, in Armenian. It distinguishes the objective from the nominative : e.g. *sirel zAstovaz,* " to love God, *amar á Dios.*" It also marks other cases : as— *erthal zoskvoy,* " to go *for* gold" (*oski*) ;—*arkanel znowav,* " to put *upon* him." On the whole, whether

prefixed to verbs, where it is augmentative or deter-
minative, or to pronouns and nouns, where it is the
latter, its force seems nearly the same as that of ἐπί.*

In addition to *zilachnke avil* .. , *lupu avils* XVII, and
avils LX *lupuke*, we find in Fabretti (2059), *zilachnuke
lupuke*, "infoditur, moritur,"—"he is dead and buried."
This shews that *zilachnke* is not synouymous with *lupu*
and *lupuke*, and can, therefore, hardly mean anything
else than " he is buried" or " interred." If so, and the
root be *lach*, = Armenian *et̓ag*, "fossa," the manner
in which the Armenian enables us to build up *zilachnke*
is very remarkable. As the Armenian *phokh* gives
phokhé and *phokhonaké*, "he exchanges," we should
first get *et̓aganaké*, "fodit(ur);" and, as *et̓t* gives
zetelé, "he places," we should next get *zet̓aganaké*,
"infodit(ur)," = *zilachnke* or *zilachnuke*.

I now come to nine epitaphs of the greatest value,
as they contain Etruscan numerals, not in *figures*, but
in *words*. I shall, therefore, give them at length, with
their numbers in Fabretti :—

2104. Larthi Keisi Keises Velns Velisnas Ravnthus sech
        avils sas Amke Uples.†

---

* The Armenian word *si*, = Zend *si*, = Sanskrit *hi*, signifies
"for, nam, denn, γάο."

† *Amke Uples* was probably the person who provided the tomb,
or undertook the burial. See 2070 and 2340, where *Amke* seems
the nominative to *kepen tenu* and *kisum tame* .., "offers the grave,"
and "buries the corpse." *Kepen* may be the accusative of a noun
corresponding to the Armenian *govb*, gen. *gb̄-oy*, "a ditch, a
cistern;" and *tenu* would be equivalent to the Armenian *tani*,
"tenet, tendit." *Kisum*, as will be shown subsequently, may be
the accusative of *kis-*, "a corpse," and *tame*...... "buries," appears

2119. Vipinanas Vel Kla
    nte Ultnas La(r)thal klan
        avils tivrs sas

2033 *bis.* Vel Leinies Larthial Ruka Arnthialum
        klan Vclasam prumaths *avils scsphs*
        lupuke

2071. Larth Churchles Arnthal Churchles Thanch-
    vilus(k) Krakial
      klan a*vils kiemzathrms lupu*

2070. Arnth Churkles Larthal klan Ramthas Pevtnial
    vilk Parchis Amke
     Maranach Sparana kepeu tenu a*vils machs*
    semphalchls lupu

2340. Ramthn Matulnei sech Markvs Matulm . . .
        puiam Amke Sethres Keis(in)ies kisam tame...u
        Laf . nask Matulnask klalum* ke . s kiklena R.m.
        a . . *avenke lupum* a*vils (m)achs mealchlsk*
        Eitvapia me...

2335*a.* Larth Arnthal Precas klan
        Ramth(a)s Apatrual eslz
        zilachnthas† *avils thunesi muvalchls lupu*

2335*d.* A . . ikne . . eltna . . . . turefnesithvas
    a*vils kis muvalchl* . . . .

2108. Vipinans Sethre Velthur . . Meklasial Thanchvilu
    a*vils kis kealch(l)s*

---

akin to the Armenian *damban*, " a sepulchre." *Ravnthus* (2104)
should probably be *Ramthas*, as 2070 and 2340 seem to shew: but
I shall not correct the proper names.

   * *Klalum*, " murorem, funera." Greek κλαίω. Armenian *lal*,
" mourning, lamentation."

   † Qu. *zilachnuks*, "sepelitur."

In 2340, we meet with .. *avenke lupum* instead of
lupu. This form must he explained before proceeding
to analyse the numerals. The root of .. *avenke*, one of
the Etruscan -*ke* forms, like *lupuke, turuke, turke*, and
erske, would probably be the Sanskrit *av*, "servare,"
which is found in the Armenian *ap-avén*, "refuge;"
ap- being equivalent to the Sanskrit *apa, ap-*, and tho
Greek ἀπό, ἀπ-. *Apavini* means in Armenian, "ho
takes refuge, he consigns himself;" so that the active
apaviné would mean "he consigns," and the Etruscan
.. *avenke lupum* would he rendered "deponit corpus."

But .. *avenke* might, perhaps, bo better explained,
still keeping to the same root *av*, "servare," from the
Armenian :—

> *avan(d)*,* "deposit, consignment."
>
> *avand-el*, "to deposit, to give up.".
>
> *avandé zhogin*, "he gives up the *ghost (hogi)*,
> he dies;" a singular parallel to the Etruscan
> .. *avenke lupum*, "he gives up the *body*, he dies."

I will notice at a later period the terms of parentage
or descent in these epitaphs, *klan, sech*, and *puiam*, the
accusative of *puia*, "filia." Their explanation is not
necessary, as that of .. *avenke lupum* was, to prepare
the way for the consideration of the numerals, to which
we will now proceed. From the first three of the
epitaphs we get :—

> avils *sas*
>
> avils *tivre sas*

---

* Compare τείνω and tendo; also Armenian spand, "slaughter,"
from span, "kill;" and avan, "village" (= Sanskrit avani, "terra"),
and sar-avand, "headland" (sar, "head").

avils *sesphs* lupuke

"ætatis ...... obit."

I need scarcely cite such forms as *avils* XXXVI *lupu* and *avils* LX *lupuke*, to prove that *sesphs*, in *avils sesphs lupuke*, is a numeral: but I must defer its consideration for the present, as Fahretti gives the reading as *sesphs* in the inscriptions, hut as *semphs* in the vocabnlary; and *semph*, as will be aeen later, appears to be the Etruscan for "seven." In *avils sas*, nnd *avils tivrs sas*, *sas* would be "six," = Sanskrit *śaś*, = Persian *śaś*, = Lithuanian *szeszi*, = Latin *sex*, = Greek ἕξ, = Armenian *weź*, = Afghan *śbaź*, = Zend *khsvas*, = Ossetic *achsāz:* and *tivr-s* would he "thirty," = Welsh *trideg*, = Latin *tri-ginta*, = Lithuanian *trys-deszimtis*, = Sanskrit *triñ-çat*, = Zend *thri-çata*, = Armenian *eresovn*, = Afghan *dér-ś*. This last form is very liko the Etruscan, which should, perhaps, he *tier-s*, as *E* and *V (F)* are easily confounded.

We now pass to the fourth epitaph, which gives:—

avils *kiemzathrms* lupn

"ætatis ....obit."

This epitaph belongs, as is seen from tho effigy, to an old man *(uomo vecchio)*, and would, therefore, involve "fifty," "sixty," "seventy," or even "eighty." If *kiemz-* be pnt by the aide of *tivrs* or *tiers*, "thirty," it will he apparent that *kiem* may mean "five," and the following table will shew how it ranges with other Aryan forms for that numeral:—

Sanskrit...*pańćan*

Persian...*pang*

Lithuanian...*penki*

Armenian $\begin{cases} hing \\ yi\text{-} \end{cases}$

Latin $\begin{cases} quinque \\ quin\text{-} \end{cases}$

Gaelic...*cuig*

Etruscan...*kiem*

Swedish...*fem*

Gothic...*fimf*

Welsh...*pump*

Greek $\begin{cases} \pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\epsilon \\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon \end{cases}$

Afghan...*pínža*

Kiemz- thus means "fifty." = Sanskrit *pañ́čúçat*, = Persian *pangáh*, = Afghan *panžús*, = Armenian *yisovn*, = Swedish *femtio*, = Gaelic *caogad*, = Latin *quinquaginta*, = Bohemian *padesat*. The termination of *kiemzathrms* would seemingly involve *thr-*, "three," = Sanskrit *tri*, = Zend *thri*, = Armenian *ey* and *ere(ch)*, = Afghan *diré :* and *-m-* in *-thrms* might be the sign of the ordinal, as in the Latin pri-*mus* and the Lithuanian pir-*mas*, "fir-st," which Bopp compares with the Sanskrit para-*ma*, "eximius, summus." The final *s* in *kiemzathrms* would then mark the genitive, and the whole word would signify "(anni) quinquagesimi tertii." If so, there are five Aryan characteristics in *kiem-za-thr-m-s.*

The sibilants in *-s* and *-z*, "-ginta, -κοντα," would indicate that the Etruscan language did not belong to the same Aryan family as the Greek and Latin, and that it was not Celtic or Teutonic. In the Etruscan

-*s* or -*z*, tho *n* of tho Armenian -*sovn* or -*san*, " -ginta,"
is dropped, as it is in the Afghan -*ś* or -*s*. There is
the same omission in tho Ossetic *däs*, tho Hindustani
des, tho Persian *dah*, and tho Welsh *deg*, " ten," which
are all = Sanskrit *daçan*, Armenian *tasn* or *tasan*,
Latin *decem*, Gothic *taihun*. This *n* is wanting also in
the Sanskrit -*çat* and the Zend -*çata*, " -ginta;" hut an
additional *t* suffix is introduced, as in Latin and Greek,
of which the Etruscan and Armenian know nothing.
The Old Slavonic has not only this *t*, hut retains he-
sides, like the Teutonic languages, tho *da* of *daça(n)*
in the Sanskrit -*(da)çat*, " -ginta." Thus tho Slavonic
for " thirty" and "fifty" are *tri-desjatj* and *pjatj-desjatj*,
which are very unliko tho Etruscan *tier-s* and *kiem-z*.
The Lithnanian has *trys-deszimtis* and *penkios-desz-
imtis* for " thirty" and " fifty." The Etruscan prohlem
seems thus nearly reduced to a choice between the
Sanskrit and tho Armenian ; and if tho Sanskrit could
he got rid of, the Armenian would then ho left alone.
Another letter-change, which will be noticed later,
may ho ablo to do this.

The last fivo epitaphs exhibit these forms :—

> avils *kis muvalchl(s)*.
> avils *kis kealch(l)s*.
> . . avonke lnpum avils *(m)achs mealchls*.*
> avils *machs semphalchls*† lupu.

---

* In accordance with the other forms, I drop tho final *k* here,
which would probably belong to the following word. Snch mis-
takes are not uncommon.

† Thus written in Fabretti's inscriptions, whioh the other
forms shew to be right: in his vocabulary, *semphachls*.

avils *thunesi muvalchls* lupn.

.   " ætatis . . . . obit."

The age of the deceased is obviously given by the words in italics. What then is the meaning of *-alchls* or *lchls*, which is found in all five of these numerals? Or rather, what is the meaning of *-lchl*, for *s* may be the sign of the genitive or plural? In all probability, *-lchl* is "-deeim," or "-ginta," or "-genti." But it is not likely to be "-ginta," for *tier-s* and *kiem-z* are "tri-ginta" and "quinqua-ginta." Nor would it be "-decim," for *machs semphalchls* is shewn by the effigy on the tomb to be the age of an "old man," who was certainly out of his *teens*, unless they were *teens* of *lustres*. *Lchl* would thus appear to be "-genti," = *centum*. Now the Latin *centum* and the Sanskrit *çata* are each 10×10, and = *decem-decem-tum* and *daçan-daçan-ta*. *Lchl* is probably a similar form, as may be intimated by the repetition of the *l*, and = *lch-lch*, 10×10. We have therefore to trace *lch*, "ten."

It is found first in the Lapponic *lokke*, "ten," where we have also the form *lokkad lokke*, "quod dicit *decimum decem*, hoc est *centum*" (Ihre). The Lapponie *lokk-et*, "numerare, *legere*," shews that the fundamental idea in *lokke*, "ten," is the same as in δέκα, which is connected with δείκω, = *dico*, "λέγω." In fact, *lokke* is "*digit*, number," and is allied to the Lappouic suffix *-lokk*, "omnis, unusquisque," from which we may pass to the Armenian *lok*, "solus, simplex," and to the Tuschi *-loghe* or *-lghe*, which forms ordinals out of cardinals, as in *yethchloghe*, "sixth," from *yethch*, "six," and *qhalghe*, "third," from *qho*, "three."

Lch, "ten," may also be explained from the Lithuanian -*lika*, " -leven, -teen," i. e. "ten," which would = the Polish *lik*, "number." It cannot thus be said that the Etruscan -*lchl*, "-genti," is necessarily of Turanian origin; though, if it were so, it would not be surprising, as the Alpine *lawine*, "avalanche," and *käss*, "glacier," appear to be Turanian words, and the latter = Lapponic *kaisse*, "mons altior, plerumque nive tectus." Yet I think *lchl* is most likely Turanian; for there were, as will be found, Turanian numerals in Etruscan, and the Aryan for " hundred" in Etruscan seems to be *tesnsteis*, a reduplication of *tesne*, "ten," = Armenian *tasn*.·

All now comes out easily. *Me-a-lchls* and *muv-a-lchls* both signify " one-hundred" or " one-hundredth;" the Etruscan *me-* and *muv-*, " one," corresponding to the two Armenian forms, *mi* and *mov*, " one," with *me-* in *me-tasan*, "eleven." The connecting vowel *a*, in *me-a-lchls* and *muv-a-lchls*, and in the other similar Etruscan forms, is the same as in Armenian, where we find *mi-a-pet*, " μόν-αρχος ;" *mi-a-kin*, " having only one wife;" *char-a-chayl*, " quadruped;" *char-a-kerp*, " quadriform." *Ke-a-lchls* is " five-hundred " or "five-hundredth ;" for it will soon be seen that "five" is *ki*, as well as *kiem*, in Etruscan. We have, too, the Armenian *yi-sovn*, "fifty," as·well as *hing*, "five;" and we know that *m* is elided in Latin between two vowels, as in *co-arguo*, = *cum-arguo*. Finally, *semph-a-lchls*, if *semph* be right, is "seven-hundred," or "seven-hundredth ;" *semph-*, " seven," being = Latin *septem*,

Sanskrit *saptan*, Slavonic *sedmj*, Russian *sem*, Zend *haptan*, Armenian *evthn*, *eóthn*, Greek ἑπτά. The Armonian *evthn*, "seven," would explain the Albaniaa *yavë* aad the Rhæto-Romanco *evna*, "week," just as the Kurdish *ahft*, "sevea," oxplaias the Kardish *ahftie*, "wook." The present Albaniau word for "sevea" is *šta(të)*, from which *yavë* could not ho derived. The Armenian for "week" is *eóthneak* or *eavthneak*.

Tho Etruscan "-goati" forms may throw some light on aaother question. Tho Aryans uso threo distinct words for "thousand." Tho Slavonian aad Lithuanian terms are like tho German *tausend*, as the Armenian *hazar* is like the Sanskrit *sahasra*, and tho Celtic *mile* and *mil* are like the Latin *mille*. The Etrascan *mealchl*, "one-hundred," might lead us to oxplain *mille* as "one-thousand," as if $= mi\text{-}lch \times lch \times lch$ contracted; and it is possible that $\chi\lambda\text{-}\iota o\iota$ might he "thousand," $= (\lambda)\chi \times \lambda(\chi \times \lambda\chi)$, as *centum* is *(decende)centum*. The forms of *mil* and $\chi\iota\lambda$- are liko tho Tuschi *met*, "quot," which appears derived from *me*, "qui," by the addition of *t*, "number," $=$ Lapponio *lokke*, $=$ Etruscan *lch*, $=$ Polish *lik*. "How many there are"$=$"what a number there are."

Nothiag romains for explanation bat *machs*, *thunesi*, and *kis*. Now *machs semphalchls*, as is known hy the effigy, is the age of an "old man," who might have lived nearly sixty ycars, or aboat "seven-handred *months*." *Machs* would thas bo tho genitive or plural of *mach*, "a month," $=$ Saaskrit *mâs*, "moon," $=$

Persian *mâh*, = Armenian *mah-ik* (a diminutive in *ik*),
" the crescent moon." The letter-change in the Etrus-
can *mach*, from the Sanskrit sibilant to the Aric
aspirate, should not he overlonked; but in the Ar-
menian *amis*, "mnnth," it is not observed. Finally,
as *ril* is "year," and *mach* is " month," *thunesi* (p. 42)
wonld he " days," or "day's," and is explained hy the
Armenian *tovnǰean*, which is used as the genitive of
tiv, "a day," and might bo the proper genitive of
tovniǰ, as *teslean* is nf *tesil*. Lars (2335 *a*) would be
an infant who only reached the agu of a hundred days,
while Ramtha (2340), whn is described as *puiam*,
" filiam," would be a girl of a hnndred months old, or
in her ninth year when she died. I have nnt dis-
tinguished the two Etruscan characters for *s*, ono of
which, that in *thunesi*, is suppnsed tn correspond to the
English *sh*, which is nearly tho Armenian *ǰ*.

The Etruscan *thunes(i)* and the Armenian *tovniǰ* ap-
pear to be compnsed of the Armenian *tov(oy)*, the
genitive of *tiv*, "a day,"—a word which may be allied
to *thiv*, gen. *thovoy*, " number, year, epoch,"—and of
the Armenian *niš*, gen. *nši*, i.e. *nëši*, " sign, mark," =
Hebrew *nês*. The Armenian cnmbines *niš* with the
prononns, *ays*, *ayn*, " this, that," in tho expressions,
ays niš, *ayn niš*, " such a one, ὁ δεῖνα;" hoth being
forms similar tn the Etruscan *thu-neši*, " diei," and to
what would be a genuinn Armenian word, *tov-nëǰi*,
with the same significatinn. And let it be remembered
that it is not from the resemblance nf the Etrnscan
thu-neši to the Armenian *tov-nëǰi* that it is interpreted

" diei." It is from independent argument, not from similarity of sound, that *leine, lupu, avil, ril, mach,* and *thunes,* are concluded to mean respectively, "lives," "dies," "age," "year," "month," and " day," the six terms which we find in Latin epitaphs where the age of the deceased is given.

Niebuhr noticed that on two occasions the Etruscans made truce with the Romans, once for *twenty,* and the other time for *forty years ;* but yet were again at war with them, and apparently without breaking truce, at the end of *eighteen* and *thirty-six* years respectively. Niebuhr explains this by saying that the Etruscan year would have contained only *ten months.* No doubt the explanation is correct, and the truces would have been made for *two-hundred* and *four-hundred months.* This shews how the Etruscans were in the habit of reckoning by periods of *one-hundred months,* each of which periods would have been a kind of double lustre, just as the Latin has *bilustris* for a period of ten years. Of course such periods could only have been used in epitaphs when the age of the deceased happened to be nearly bilustral ; and this may explain why, in the case of two members of one family (*ante,* p. 37, epit. 2070, 2071), the age of one of them is defined by the words, *avils kiemzathrms lupu,* and that of the other by the words, *avils machs semphalchls lupu.* Larth Churchles lived *fifty-three years, ril* being understood ; and Arnth Churkles *seven-hundred months,* or about *fifty-eight years.* But perhaps *one-hundred months = eight years.* *

---

* An Etruscan week was *eight days* (Niebuhr).

Kis may he explained in two different manners. When *kis muvalchls* and *kis kealchls* are compared with *machs mealchls* and *machs semphalchls* (*ante*, p. 41), it might he inferred that *kis = machs*, and therefore that *ki* means " month." If so, we have another Turanian word; for "moon, month," is *ku* in Esthonian, and *kuu* in Fin; while in Georgian " moon, month," is *thve*, and in Tuschi " white" is *kui*: all terms probably akin ultimately to the Sanskrit *çve(ta)*, " *whi(te)*."* Otherwise, as there is no equivalent for *lupu*, " dies," or *avenke lupum*, " leaves a corpse," in the two epitaphs which contain *kis* (p. 41), that word might he explained from the Armenian *géś*, gen. *giśi*, " a corpse ;" and *machs*, " months," would be understood, like *ril*, " years," elsewhere. At any rate, *kisum* would be rendered "*νεκρόν*" in 2340 (*ante*, p. 37), where it is in opposition to *Ramthn*. The beginning of that epitaph would mean: *Ramtham Matulnæ prolem, Marci Matulnæ filiam, Amycus a Sethre Cæsennia νεκρὸν sepelit.* So, too, in the first line of another epitaph (Fabretti 2339) we read :—

Larth Keisinis Velns klan *kizi zilachnke*— where *kizi zilachnke* would be rendered " dies (and) is buried," or " (being) dead is buried," or " is buried with the dead ;" according as we make *kizi* an Armenian verb like *lini* (ante, p. 29), or a noun like *ovti*, " a way," or a noun like *géś*, " a corpse." Very probably, *kis* and *kisum* are unconnected in sense.

---

* Mouna *Kea* in Hawaii is the "*White* Mountain." It is the Mont Blanc of the Sandwich Islands.

I now turn to notice the doubtful inscription, *avils sesphs lupuke*, where the *sesphs* of the inscription is given as *semphs* in Fabretti's vocabulary, and thero interpreted "seventy," after the analogy of *semph*, " seven," in that form which he gives as *semph-alchls* in his inscriptions, and as *semph-achls* in his vocabulary.   There are thus, in Fabretti, three to one in favour of *semph*, " seven," as against *sesph*, which would have to be referred to the Basque *zazpi*, "soven." Now, as *tiers* would be "thirty," *semphs* or *sesphs* would rightly bo " seventy," if *semph* or *sesph* be " seven."   But there is one objection to the interpretation.   The epitaph, *avils sesphs lupuke* or *avils semphs lupuke*, is annexed to the figure of a young man (*giovane*), which would seem from the description of the tomb to represent tho deceased, though it may not do so.   If it does, as tho Etruscan *ph* and *th* nearly resemblo each other, the true reading might possibly bo *sesths* or *semths* (for *semphths*), " sixteen" or "seventeen."   In this case, *-ths* would = Welsh *-theg*, Sanskrit *-daçan*, Armenian *-tasan;* the final *-an* being dropped in *-ths*, just as in the change from the Armenian *-sovn* or *-san*, "-ginta," to tho Etruscan *-s*.   On the wholo, I should think Fabretti's vocabulary and interpretation most likely to be right as to this doubtful word, and that we ought to read *semphs*, "seventy," rather than anything else.   But it is not a word that can be much relied on.*

---

* The Etruscan *m* and *s* (*sh*) are liable to be confounded.   In the same epitaph, Arnthialum should probably be Arnthialus.

The Porugian Inscription, which appears to be a conveyance of land for a burying-ground, may help us to arrive at some other Etruscan numerals. We find there, in two different parts:—

      ......*chiem*fusle.........

and also—   ....sleleth*karu*

        *tezan*fusleri *tesusteis*

        rasnes.................

As *chiem* seems probably = *kiem*, "five," *karutezan* may be a number; and if so, would apparently be "fourteen," = Sanskrit *ćaturdaçan*, = Armenian *ćorechtasan*: but in *chara*-sovn, "forty," the Armenian approaches more nearly to the first part of *karu*-tezan. The second extract above concludes with—

              tesusteis

          rasnes

and we have besides—*tesne* eka velthinathurasth

              aurabelu*tesnerasne*kei

              *tesnsteis rasnes*chimth*sp*

Here *rasne* would not improbably be the Persian *rasan*, Armenian *arasan*, "a cord," Sanskrit *rasana*, "a girdle," and might mean "fathom." Cf. $\sigma\chi o\hat{\imath}\nu o\varsigma$; also German *klafter*, "cord, fathom," *faden*, "thread, fathom." *Fusle* may have been some larger measure than *rasne*. As we may possibly have *sesths*, "sixteen," elsewhere, *chimths* might be "fifteen;" though this seems inconsistent with *karutezan*, "fourteen," and is open to other objections. But there would be less reason for doubting that *tesne* is "ten," = Armenian *tasn*, = Sanskrit and Zend *daçan*; and if it be, then

                                            E

tcsnsteis would probably be "ten tens," or "a hundred;" a formation like *lchl*, excepting that *tesns-*, "tens," has the sign of tho plural. The Armenian *tasn* is declined, the genitive being *tasin*, and the instrumental *tasamb*. The Sanskrit *çata*, "hundred," would be formed from *daça(n)-daça(n)-ta* by a process very different from that employed in the formation of *tesnsteis*. The Armenian for "a hundred" is *harivr*, which is an entirely different word.

Kiem, sas, semph, and *tesne,* have been interpreted "five," "six," "seven," and "ten," by others before myself, as may be seen in Fabretti's index. I now come to something more remarkable than the existeaco of Aryan numerals in Etruscan; a fact which would have been expected in a language that is plainly Aryan. *There are numerals in Etruscan which are not Aryan,* as *lchls* has perhaps intimated already. This importaat discovery coancets itself with what I said in my first chapter. I there noticed that there wero ia ancient times *Iberians, Liqyes,* and *Tuscans,* not only aloag the Mediterranean from Gibraltar to tho Tiber, bat likewise all threo in the Caucasian regions: also that there are now *Toscans* in Albania, and *Tuschi* in the Caucasus; and that the Tuschi word *law,* "snow," explaias the *lawine* of the Alps. It appears too from Livy (x. 4) that there was a difference between the town and couatry speech in Etruria. Now ou a pair of Etruscan dice (Fabretti, 2552) the first six numbers aro given in words: and by comparing tho relative positions of these words with the relativo positions, on

a quantity of other ancient dice, of the same numbers expressed by points, Campanari has determined their value to be as follows:—

I	II	III	IV	V	VI.
mach	thu	zal	huth	ki	sa.*

Here *mach* is Aryan, and may be compared with the Armenian *miak*, "unique, one." *Thu* and *sa* are Aryan, though not exclusively, as they are like the Circassian *tu* and the Basque *sei*. The Irish for "six" is *sé*. *Zal*, "three," is not Aryan. *Huth* is not Aryan,

---

* I do not know whether any exceptions will be taken to my interpretations of *machs*, *kis*, and *thunesi* (*ante*, p. 41), because *mach*, *ki*, and *thu* are here found to be Etruscan numerals. But, if *machs* and *kis* be there interpreted as "first" and "fifth," we should then have to understand *ril*, "year," and therefore to interpret *mealchls* and *muvalchls* as "tenth," *kealchls* as "fiftieth," and *semphalchls* as "seventieth." This seems to me improbable: and even if it were allowable to interpret *muvalchls* as "tenth," what are we to make of *thunesi* in *avils thunesi muvalchls lupu*, "ætatis (anni for anno)......(et) decimi obit?" *Thunesi* ought to be the genitive of a number, as well as *machs* and *kis*, and would therefore have to signify "eight" or "nine," as all the other numeral places are occupied. Now *thu* is "two" in Etruscan, and there are languages, of which the Hungarian is one, where "eight" = 4 × 2; so that *thu-nesi* or *thu-nes* might be "eight," if *nesi* or *nes* were "four": and "four" is *négy* in Hungarian, and *net* in Ostiak, two Finnish dialects. Indeed, "eight" in Ostiak is *nida*, which would = *net-da*, 4 × 2. It is thus *possible* for *thu-nesi* to be "eight." But, if *muva-lchl-s* be "ten," the second *l* would be non-radical, as *lch*, according to analogy, would mean "ten" by itself. Yet this might not be impossible, as the *t* termination in the Classical, Zend, and Sanskrit "-ginta" and "-genti" forms is non-radical too, and the *t* termination of the Sanskrit participle becomes, as will appear later, an *l* termination in Armenian and Etruscan. Or *lch-l* might be "ten-*h*," as qha-*lghe* is "thir-*d*" in Tuschi (*ante*, p. 42).

and both *huth* and *ki* seem Caucasian. This may appear by comparing these six Etruscan numerals with the same numerals in Circassian, Tuschi, Georgian, and Lazic :—

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI.
Circassian .	*se*	*tu*	*śi*	*ptl'e*	*t'chu*	*chi.*
Tuschi	*źha*	*śi*	*qho*	*dhew*	*phchi*	*ycthch.*
Georgian...	*erthi*	*ori*	*sami*	*othkhi*	*khuthi*	*ckhvsi.*
Lazic	*ar*	*ʒur*	*ǵum*	*otkh*	*khut*	*aś.*
Etruscan ...	*mach*	*thu*	*zal*	*huth*	*ki*	*sa.*

In *th-khu-meti*, "fifteen," the Georgian *khuthi*, "five," is contracted to *khu.** The Etruscan *ki*, "five," might be obtained from the Georgian *kh(uth)i*, or the Tuschi *(ph)chi;* or nearly from the Circassian *(t')chu;* or from the Lesgi *chewa* and *yku*, which mean "five" in two different dialects; or from the Abkhasian *chu(ba)*, "five," where *ba* is a suffix for all numerals from two to ten, so that *chu* would be the number "five." The Etruscan *huth*, "four," would probably not be the *oth* of the Georgian *othkhi*, "four," but would be related to the Georgian *khuthi*, "five," and the Lazic *khut*, nearly as the Georgian o-*thkhi*, "four," and the Tuschi *ye-thch*, "six," are to the Circassian *t'chu*, "five." For the Georgian -*thkhi* in o-*thkhi*, and the Tuschi -*thch* in *ye-thch*, are both apparently = Circassian *t'chu*, "five," while the Tuschi *ye* in *ye-thch*, and the Georgian *o* in o-*thkhi*, may both be explained from the Ossetic *yu*, *yeu*, or *yeue*, "one." That is to

---

* *Th-* is "ten," and -*meti* is like the Ostiak ordinal sign -*met*.

say, the Georgian *o-thkhi*, "four," is "one *from* five,"
IV; and the Tuschi *ye-thch*, "six," is "one *to* five,"
VI. So, in the Georgian *ekh-vsi*, "six," -*vsi* would
probably = Fin *wiisi*, "five," while *ekh-* is "one,"
= Sanskrit *eka*, = Persian *yak*, = Abkhasian *aku*,
= Hungarian *egy*, = Fin *yk*, which becomes *yh-* in
yh-deksa, "nine," i. e. "one from ten," IX. If now the
ekh-, "one," of the Georgian *ekh-vsi*, "six," be pre-
fixed to the Georgian *khuthi*, "five," we could obtain
for "one *from* five," IV, the form *ekh-khuthi*, which
might be changed, by incorporation and contraction,
into the Etruscan *huth*, "four," in which a χ, imply-
ing "one," is lost at the beginning of the word, as it
would really be also in the Etruscan *sa*, "six," as
well as in the Sanskrit *śaś*. The following tabular
view may present the argument more clearly:—

Etruscan ......(χ)——*sa*, VI (= *one + five*).
Abkhasian ... *śva*, X (= *fives*).
Ossetic.........*ach — sāz*, VI (= *one + five**).
Zend ....*kh*——*svas*, VI.
Sanskrit ... $\begin{cases} (\chi)\text{——}\textit{śaś}, & \text{VI.} \\ \textit{eka}, & \text{............ I.} \end{cases}$
Abkhasian ...*aka*, ... I.
Ossetic...... $\begin{cases} \textit{yu}, & \text{.............. I.} \\ \textit{yeu}, & \text{............ I.} \end{cases}$
Circassian ... *t'chu*, V.
Tuschi ....*ye*—— *thch*, VI.

---

* That *sāz*, etc., probably = "five," will be shewn in the last
chapter. The true value is seen in the Basqui *zazpi*, "seven,"
where ·*pi* = *bi*, "two."

Georgian ... $\begin{cases} o \text{ ——} thkhi, & \text{IV.} \\ \quad . \quad khuthi, & \text{V.} \end{cases}$

Lazic ...... $\begin{cases} o \text{ ——} tkh, & \text{IV.} \\ \quad khut, & \text{V.} \end{cases}$

Etruscaa ... $\begin{cases} (\chi)\text{——}huth, & \text{IV.} \\ \quad ki, & \text{V.} \end{cases}$

Lesgi ....   *chewa,*   V.

Circassian ... (χ)——*chi,*   VI.

Tuschi ....   *phchi,**   V.

Abkhasian ... (χ)——*phśi,*   IV.

Circassian ...   *pśe,*   X (= *fives*).

It will bo perceived from the forms at the head of this table how a gnttural aspirate is lost before *s*. But such an aspirate wonld bo still more likely to be lost when it preceded another aspirate, as in that case tho fusion of the two aspirates into one wonld be almost saro to take place. And so, by the loss of the prefixed aspirate implying I, the Etruscan *huth*, IV, may = tho Georgian *khuthi* and the Lazic *khut*, V, nearly as tho Abkhasian *phśi*, IV, = Tuschi *phchi*, V, and as the Circassian *chi*, VI, = Etruscan *ki*, V. As *Octavius* is written *Uhtave* in Etruscaa, the Etrascan *h* would be guttaral, liko tho Hebrew *cheth* which it represents. Tho cxplanation of the Etruscan *zal*, "three," mnst bo resorved to tho fifth chapter, whcro tho subject of numorals can be more fully discussed : at prcscnt I can only exhibit it in connexion with some other numerals for "three," to which it appears wholly or partially allied :—

---

* Cf. Georgian *phekhi*, "foot."

Fiunish ...... $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text{Fin } ....ko\text{-}lmi \\ \text{Syrianic } ......lu\text{-}jm*\end{array}\right.$

Cancasian ... $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text{Lazic } ....gu\text{-}m \\ \text{Mingrelian } ...su\text{-}mi \\ \text{Georgian } ......sa\text{-}mi \\ \text{Etruscan } ......za\text{-}l \\ \text{Javancso } ......td\text{-}lu\end{array}\right\}$ "three," = "2 from 5," IIV.

Another representative of "five," l or l-m, is intro-
duced here, and may also be found in the Circassian
pt-$l'e$, IV, and $b'le$, VII.† Such terms for "five," as
will bo shewn in the sequel, are all different words
for "hand" or "foot": the Cornish *lau*, the Gaelic
làmh, the Turkish *él*, and the Malay *lìma*, all signify
"hand." It is rather strange that the Etruscans should
have used two languages for the numbers on their
dice: but we do something of the same kind in England,
as we usually employ French names for the numbers
on dice, but sometimes English; while in the case of
cards wo hogin with French, but soon pass into English.
If the language of tho Rasenæ he represented by
Anglo-French, and that of tho Pelasgians by English,
then tho six numbers on the Etruscan dice would he:
ace, deuce (or *two*), *three, four, five, six.* *Sa* might be
sice, but I think it more likely to ho *six,* as *sas* would
bo tho Etruscan representative of *sice.* Yet, as *sa* is

---

* In speaking, we drop *l* before *m* in *holm*, and in *balm, calm,*
psalm: but we retain it in *elm, helm,* and *whelm,* and also in *film.*

† In Basque, *bat* is I, *bi* is II, and *lau* is IV, perhaps rightly V.
If so, tho two Circassian forms are easily explained from the
Basque, as "one from five," and "two to five."

"six," *sas* might be "sixty" in Etruscan, if we had
not *avils tiers sas* as well as *avils sas*. But how
would the Etruscans have expressed "sixty," which,
if *sas* were "six," ought according to analogy to be
sas-s or *sas-z*? The Armenian gets over the difficulty
by changing *z* into *th*. Thus "six" is *wez*; "sixteen,"
weśtasan; and "sixty," *wathsovn*.

I have spoken of the Etruscan numerals, *zal, huth,
ki,* and *sa,* as being *Pelasgian*. Now that there were
Pelasgians in Etruria is so commonly known that one
quotation will suffice. The writer who is called Scymnus
Chius says :—

    Μετὰ τὴν Λιγυστικὴν Πελασγοὶ δ' εἰσὶν, οἱ
    Πρότερον κατοικήσαντες ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος,
    Κοινὴν δὲ Τυρρηνοῖσι χώραν νεμόμενοι.

To what element in the population of Etruria, unless
to the Pelasgians, can we attribute the numerals in
question? We know the Umbrian language to be an
Aryan dialect resembling the Latin, and we meet con-
tinually with *tre* and *tref*, "three," in the Eugubine
Tables. The Tyrrhenians, again, as distinguished above
from the Pelasgians, are there derived, according to
the common tradition, from Lydia, and would have
spoken that Aryan language of the Armenian type
which we have found predominant in Etruria. The
conclusion seems almost inevitable. We learn from
Herodotus that the Pelasgians whom he knew spoke a
barbarous dialect. It would now appear that it was
not even Aryan; although, if the numerals in question
be considered as Caucasian, and the origin of the

Etruscans from Armenia he admitted, it might be urged as possible that the Etruscans borrowed them when there from the Caucasians, who would have possessed Armenia before the Aryans came thither out of Media. I should, however, for my own part, entirely reject such a solution, especially as the numerals are not the only indication of the presence of Caucasians in the South of Europe.

The following list will comprise such numerals as have been detected in Etrusean :—

  I. *mach, me-, muv-*
  II. *thu*
  III. *zal, thr-*
  IV. *huth, kar-* (?)
  V. *ki, ke-, kiem-, chiem* (?)
  VI. *sa, sas*
  VII. *se(m)ph*
  X. *tesne*
  XIV. *karutezan* (?)
  XV. *chimths* (?)
  XXX. *ti(e)rs.*
  L. *kiemz.*
  LIII. *kiemzathr-*
  LXX. *se(m)phs* (?)
  C. *tesnsteis, mealchl, muvalchl*
  D. *kealchl*
  DCC. *se(m)phalchl*

We see here an Aryan language which contains some Turanian words, as *dozen* and *century* are contained in the English language. The explanation has just been

suggested.   The *Rasenæ*, or Tyrrhenians of Etruria,
were Aryans of the Thracian stock, while the *Tuscans*,
who were the *Pelasgians* or "Aborigines" (*ante*, p. 11)
of the country, were Turanians, and probably Can-
casians.   It seems likely, however, that the blood of
the Etruscans, and of the Thracians in general, was
more Taraaian than their laagnage, as the primitive
Caucasian population on which they intruded would
have been incorporated with them iato one people.
The language of the Etruscan nobles may have been at
first Thracian, with some Cancasian accretions acquired
on the way from Armenia to Etruria, while the lan-
guage of the *Tuscan* commonalty may have been
Caucasian, perhaps with a little Umbrian also.   The
languages would probably in time have coalesced, as
Anglo-Saxon, Danish, and Norman-French did into
English; but in Etraria it was the laaguage of the
aristocracy which prevailed.   The Etruscan language
is Thracian, while the English is German.*

* Mr. Ferguson has inferred, on architectural and other gronnds
distinct from language, the Turanian character of the Pelasgians
and Etruscans.   I mnst come over to his opinion, as far as the
Pelasgiana are concerned.   When I extended the Caucasians into
Europe nine years ago, it was not among them, but among the
Thracians, that I was inclined to include the Pelasgians.   One
result of the Thracian invasion of Europe by the Hellespont and
the Bosphorus would probably have been a concentration of Pe-
lasgians in Greece.   To this predominant Pelasgian or Caucasian
element in their blood the Greeks may have been greatly in-
debted for their beauty of form: nor would that form have undor-.
gone mnch alteration from what it was at first, if the Thracian
element in the Greek population consisted principally of maritime
settlers, *Leleges*, from Asia Minor, and the Italian element of

In the epitaphs which gave us the Etruscan numerals, we met with *klan, puiam,* and *sech,* words all indicating parentage or descent. *Klan,* which corresponds to *natus* in a bilingual inscription, seems connected with the Gaelic *clann,* "offspring, descendants"; the Welsh *plan,* " a scion," and *plant,* " a son ;" the Latin *planta;* and the Greek κλάς, κλάδος, κλών, κλάω, φλάω, τλάω ; words which may be allied to the Armenian *khl-el;* "to tear away, to root up *(déplanter),"* as *glan,* the Armenian for " cylinder," is derived from *gl-el,* "to roll." But another interpretation is given by K. O. Müller *(Die Etrusker,* vol. i, p. 446). He compares the two inscriptions on the same monument :

La. Venete La. Lethinl* *etera*

So. Veneto Ln. Lethial *klan*

and observes : " If *etera* be taken to mean ' other, second,' *klan* must be ' first, firstborn.'" *Etera* is thus compared with the Greek ἕτερος, = Armenian *ôtar.* Dr. Donaldson argues in the same manner *(Varronianus,* p.

---

maritime settlers, *Hellenes,* from Messapia and its neighbourhood. In blood, though not in language, the Greeks and Lycians may have been very nearly allied, like the people of Cornwall and Brittany. Gauls have become French in like manner.

Of the Etruscan words mentioned by ancient writers, one is apparently Turanian. This word is *damnus*, "Ἵππος," which seems allied to the Lapponic *támp,* " equus," the Fin *tamma,* " equa," the Armenian *sambik,* " equa, *jument,"* the Basque *samaria,* "jumentum vectorium, *caballería,"* the Albanian *samaros,* "jumentum," the Pehlvi *djemna,* "camel," and the Mantschu *temen,* "camel." The Armenian has taken up some Turanian words.

* *Lethe,* a man's name, and *Lethi,* a woman's name, are in Fabretti (1039).

171): "If then *etera* means, as is most probable, the second of a family, *klan* must mean the *first* or *head* of the family." This might bring us to the Armenian *glovkh* (= Polish *głowa*), "head, summit, the first rank;" *glkhan źovkn*, "chub" (lit. "head-fish"); *glkhani*, "the chief persons in a city, the nobility." As there exists *rain* by the side of *regen*, and *wain* by the side of *waggon* and *wagen*, the aspirate *kh* might be dropped in *glkhan*.

Another group of words is presented by the following epitaphs in Lanzi :—

>   191. mi Kalairu *fuius*
>   315. Lth. Marikane *via*
>   310. Larthi Vetus Klaukes *puia*
>   311. Aruth Vipis Serturis *puiak* ....
>   123. Anes Kaes *puil* (t)hui ....

The Latin *filius* and the Greek *υἱός* would be allied to these terms, and also the Gaelic *fuil* "blood, family, tribe, kindred." In Finnish dialects we find the Hungarian *fiú*, "son," the Syrianic *pi*, "son," and the Esthonian *poia*, "son." The Wallachian is very complete here; for it gives us *pulu*, "what is young," *fîlu*, "son," *fîa*, "daughter," and *fîika*, "θυγάτριον, töchter-lein." I find no such words in Armenian. The next expression appears to be both Finnish and Armenian :

63. Larthia Kaia Huzetnas Arnthalisa Kafatl *sak*

37. Titi Velimnias Akril *sek*

471. Ramthn Matulnei *sech* ....

Lapponic *sakko*, "proles." Armenian *źag-il*, "to be born or derived;" *źag-el*, "to produce young;" *źag*,

"a young bird ($\nu\epsilon o\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$)," = Albanian *zok*. Tho Armenian *žag* and the Albanian *zok* mean also " a *small* bird," and aro both employed to render " sparrow" (Luke x, 6).

The next expressioas are of peculiar interest on accoaat of tho monuments where thcy are fouad, as they occur in the celebrated " valley of tombs" at Castel d'Asso, as well as at Norchia and Toscanclla, and elsewhere. Bat their philological importance is of a still higher character, as they scem to dispose of the claims of tho Sanskrit to inclade the Etruscan in its own peculiar divisioa of the Aryan lauguages, while the claims of the Armeniaa staad the test, aad are coufirmed by the Etruscan forms. Oae of theso forms is *eka suthi* (accompanied by a proper name in tho nominativo); an expression which Migliarini conjectures to mean "hio situs est," or " questa è la tomba," and which must, iadced, have some similar signification. The other form is *eka suthi nesl*; and one example of it is *eka suthi nesl Tetnie*, which I should render, " here is buried the dead Titinia, *hic conditur mortua* (necata) *Titinia ;*" considering *eka suthi nesl* to be now represented iu Armoaian by *ahú sovzani nekheal*, " ecce seso condit putrefactus," which does not, however, exhibit the affinity which the Armenian bears to the Etruscan so clearly as it may be brought out by furtlicr consideration.

The letter-changes in difcrent Aryan languages should bo noticed hero. Now we havo ia tho first place—Sanskrit *hṛid* = Eaglish *heart* = German *herz*

= Greek καρδ- = Latin *cord-* = Gaelic *cridhe* = Welsh *craidd* = Armenian *sirt* = Lithuanian *szird-* = Polish *serce*; and in the next place—Sanskrit *çvan* = English *hound* = German *hund* = Greek κυν- = Latin *can-* = Gaelic *cu* = Welsh *ci* = Armenian *sovn* = Lithuanian *szun-*.* From this it may be seen that, while German languages retain the Sanskrit *h*, and convert the Sanskrit *ç* into *h*, and while Celtic and Classical languages convert both into *k*, = *c*, (and sometimes into *g*), Thracian and Sarmatian languages represent both by sibilants. Now let us apply this principle to deal with the roots of—

<div align="center">

suth-i   *nes-l*

"cond-itnr   nec-atns."

</div>

If these two Etruscan words are rightly translated into Latin (supposing *necatus* = *mortuus*), then the following comparisons will show, by the aid of the letter-changes, that the roots of the Etruscan and Latin are the same in both words, and that the Etruscan is like the Armenian in all respects. For we should have :—

Sanskrit $\begin{cases} \textit{hud}, \text{ " coacervare, submergi."} & \text{Cf. } \textit{hrid} \\ \textit{hund}, \text{ " coacervare."} \end{cases}$

$\begin{cases} \text{Welsh ...} \textit{cudd-}, \text{ " to hide."} & \textit{craidd} \\ \text{Latin ...} \textit{cond-}, \text{ " to hide, to bury."} & \textit{cord-} \end{cases}$

$\begin{cases} \text{Litbuanian .} \textit{szut-}, \text{ " acervus."} & \textit{szird-} \\ \text{Armenian . } \textit{sovz-}, \text{ " to hide, to submerge."} & \textit{sirt} \\ \text{Etruscan .. } \textit{suth-}, \text{ " to bury."} \end{cases}$

---

* Bötticher defines the Aric, or Thracian and Persian languages, as differing from Indian, German, and Latin, by using *h* for *s*, *s* for *h*, and *s* for *ç*.

Sanskrit. *naç*, "perire, mori." Cf. *daç*-an, "ten."

{ Latin . *nec-*, "kill."   *dec*-em.
{ Greek .*νεκ-*, "dio."   *δέκ*-α.

{ Armenian.*naś*, "a coffin."   *tas*-n.
{ Etruscan . *nes*, "die."   *tes*-ne.

Anglo-Saxon.*nâ, nê*,"corpse."   *ty*-n, "*zeh*-n."

Similar letter-changes occur in the Sanskrit *spaç*, "perficere," = Armenian *spas*, "function, service," *spas*-el, "to serve, to observe, to watch (*épier*)", = Latin *spec-*, = German *späh*-en, = English *spy*. The Armenian *nekh-*, "putrescere," found above in *nekh-eal*, "putrefactus," would not represent the Sanskrit *naç*, "mori," so much as the cognate Sanskrit *nakk*, "necare, destruere." There is a corresponding pair of forms in the Armenian *dovstr* and *dokht*, "daughter," = Sanskrit *duhitri*, Zend *dughdar*, Persian *dokhter*, *dokht*, Lithuanian *dukte*, Slavonic *düśti*. The termination of the Etruscan *nes-l*, = Latin *nec-atus*, is found in the Armenian *nekh-eal*. The Slavonic resembles the Armenian in having the Sanskrit and Latin *t* of the preterite participle converted into the weaker *l*; but the Lithuanian retains the *t* unchanged. Some Indian dialects exhibit *l* in the place of *t*, like the Armenian and Slavonic. In the preterite participle of the Sanskrit *naç*, the *ç* becomes *ś*; and *naśța*, "perditus," = Etruscan *nesl*, "mortuus," which resembles closely in *form* the Slavonic *nes-l'*, "having borne."

We have considered the roots of the Etruscan *suth-i nes-l*, as well as the form of *nes-l*, and have found

them all three in the Armenian language. It only remains to notice the form of *suth-i*, "conditur." Now the general characteristic of the Armenian passive is *i*, which is equivalent to that of the Sanskrit passive, *ya*. Thus, in Armenian, "he loves" is *sir-ê*, while "he is loved" is *sir-i*, which is just the form of *suth-i*. The corresponding Sanskrit form would be -*yate*; the Etruscan and Armenian converting the Sanskrit *ya* into *i*, and dropping the *t* of the third person, with the vowel that follows it. In the aorist, however, the Armenian employs the *a*, not the *y(i)* of the Sanskrit *ya*, to form the passive: thus *sirĕï-i* is "I loved," and *sirĕï-ay* is "I was loved." Compare τίθημι-ι and τίθεμ-αι, τύπτε(τ)-ι and τύπτετ-αι.*

The Rhæto-Romance *ŝalipp*, "locust," = Sanskrit *çalabha*, "locust," = Armenian *saṫap*, "gliding, quick," implies that the ancient Rhætian was like the Armenian and Etruscan in one of its letter-changes. The Greek and Latin give *kel-* for the Sanskrit *çal*, "run." The Rhæto-Romance *as-oula*, "kid" (*ante*, p. 7), if

---

* The characteristic of the Latin passive, *r*, is Celtic. Thus we find in Zeuss (*Grammatica Celtica*) these Irish forms:—*predch-idir*, "predic-atur"—*consuidig-ther*, "compon-itur"—*tuc-atar*, "intellig-untur"—*tomn-ib-ther*, "cogit-ab-itur"—and *prom-f-idir*, "prob-ab-itur." In the last two examples, the characteristic *b* of the Latin future appears also, as again in the Irish car-*ub*, "am abo," and the rest of the persons: cair-*fe*, cair-*fed*, car-*fam*, cair-*fid*, car-*fat*. In the Welsh par-*assei*, "effecerit," and agysg-*assei*, "dormiverit," we meet with forms similar to am-*asset*: and in *chlyw-yssynt*, "aud-*ivissent*, aud-*issent*," the Latin form with the root of κλύ-ω, in-*cly*-tus, and *cli*-ens. The oldest Celtic writings, from which forms like these are taken, reach back about as far as 800 A.D.

allied to *aïy*- and the Armenian *ayz*, would mark a similar peculiarity.

If the Etruscan *suth-* = Sanskrit *hud*, "coacervare, submergi," = Armenian *sovz-*, "hide, suhmerge," then the Aryan family to which tho Etruscan helongs would not be Sanskrit, hut Armenian, as it is hetween these two families that our choico would lie. Yet, as tho question seems to be reduced to this point, it may he as well to notice another distinction hetween the Sanskrit on one side, and tho Armonian and the Etruscan on the other. The Sanskrit names for a town are *pura, nagara,* and *pattana,* the *-poor, -nagore,* and *-patam* of our present India. But Etruria exhihits none of these names (though *pattana* resemhles tho Veaetiaa *Patavium*), whilo the corresponding Armenian term, *sên*, gea. *sini*, does appear there, and may indeed servo to trace the Etruscan route from the supposed "Primeval Couatry" of the Aryaus at the sources of the Oxus and the Jaxartes, up to the Po aud the Tiher. Tho followiag names, which are all taken from one author, Ptolemy, may be sufficient to exemplify this ; and it will be observed that even the Armenian vowel-change from *sén*, "village, hahitation," to its genitivo *sini*, and *sin-el*, "to build," is not without sigaificance :—

Amoag "the mountain-towns of the Sogdians along tho Jaxartes" is—

Χολβη-σίνα* ....Sogdiana.

---

* Ptolemy mentions two Armenian towns called Χολούα, and another called Χολου-άτα. Cf. Armenian *holow*, "a round."

Σίνα or Σήνα	Margiana.
Σινάκα*	Hyrcania.
Σαναΐς	Media.
Σάνα Σινίς }	Armenia.
Σανίς	Phrygia.
'Οπί-σινα or 'Οπί-σηνα†	Thrace.
Σενία	Illyria.
Και-σαίνα‡	Cisalpine Gaul.
Σαίνα§ Ούολ-σίνιον }	Etruris.

Fel-sina, the Etruscan name of Bononia (Bologna), aud Sar-sina, may be added from other authorities. The Lithuanian here touches the Thracian again ; for in Lithuanian sĕna means " wall," and sĕnys, " building." The root is also used in Georgian, and Sinope looks as if it were the Georgian senoba, "building." Cf. üñpfa (ante, p. 21).

Pliny writes, (H. N., vi. 31) : " Oritnr (Tigris) in regione Armeniæ majoris, fonte conspicuo in planitie. Loco nomen Elegosine est." This is a compound name like Volsinium, Felsina, and Sarsina. The ancients mention two places in Armonia called Elegia, and ono in Noricum called Elegium. Pliny writes again (xvi. 66): " Est ot obliqua arundo ... vocatur a quibusdam elegia." One could wish that he had named

---

these *quidam*, for *elegia* would be the Armenian *etégn*, "a reed," which appears again in the Phrygian ἔλυμος, "αὐλός,"* as well as in the Greek ἔλεγος, a word probably borrowed by the Ionians from the Lydians. It is said on the Arundel Marble: Ὕαγνις ὁ Φρὺξ αὐλοὺς πρῶτος ηὖρεν; and by Pausanias (x. 7): Ἐλεγεῖα καὶ θρῆνοι προσᾳδόμενα τοῖς αὐλοῖς.

One use that the Armenians made of reeds was, according to Xenophon, to suck up beer or barley-wine through them. This practice the Armenians had in common with the Phrygians and Thracians; a fact mentioned in his *History of Greece* by Mr. Grote, who adds, with a just appreciation of national relationship.: "The similarity of Armenian customs to those of the Thracians and Phrygians is not surprising." *Nœniœ*, like ἐλεγεῖα, were sung to the flute, which is called in Armenian *etégnaphot*, "reed-trumpet." Thus Cicero says (*De Leg.*, ii, 24): "Cantus ad *tibicinem*, cui nomen *nœniœ*." Compare νηνίατον or νινήατος, "Φρύγιον μέλος," on which word Bötticher observes: "*Nœnia* Romanorum in mentem venit, et radix *nu*, 'laudare.'" This Sanskrit root is found in the Armenian *nov-ag*, "a song," and *nov-al*, "to mew"; while νη- or *nœ*- may be referred to the Persian *nay*, "flute," = Sanskrit *nada*, "arundinis species," = Armenian *net*, "sagitta," i. e. "calamus." Thus *nœnia* seems the *nay-nu*, "flute-song," just like ἔλεγος. The Armenian word for "lute," *win*, is the Sanskrit *vínâ*, "lute";

---

* Bötticher's *Arica*, p. 34.

aud the Armenian *chnar*, "lyre," is obviously the
Greek κινύρα and the Hebrew *kinnor*.   We may see by
these instances what the comparison of languages
has exhibited all along from the first (*ante*, p. 7),
how Armenia was connected with India on one side,
and still more closely with Asia Minor, Thrace, and
Italy, on the other.

In addition to *Lorium* (*ante*, p. 29), and *Sena*,
Felsina, and Volsinium, or Volsinii, other Etruscan
names of towns may be explained from the Armenian:—
Veii, ἐφ᾽ ὑψηλοῦ σκοπέλου, from *weh*, "high"—*Volci*,
or Ὄλκιον, from *ovtkh*, "a ravine"—*Hasta*, from *hast*,
"strong"—*Blera*, from *blovr*, "a hill," and *blrak*, "a
hillock"—*Aharna*, from *akarn*, "a castle"—and *Nepete*,
from Mount *Npat* (Niphates), and *npatak*, "object,
mark."   Compare σκοπιά and σκόπελος.

I return from this rather long digression to complete
the examination of Etruscan sepulchral forms of ex-
pression.

An Etruscan word for "tomb" appears to be *tular*.
Tularu is found in the Perugian Inscription, and
Lanzi supplies these four epitaphs:—

> 457. *tular* Rasnal
> 458. *tular* Hilar....
> 460. *tular* Svuriu Au. Papsinasl....
> 461. Tetrntertular.

Tular may be interpreted "*tumulus*," and thus con-
nected with the Greek τύλη, τύλαρος, and the Gaelic
tula, "hillock"; or else be explained from the Arme-
nian *that*, "tellus," *thatel*, "to bury," *thatar*, "an

earthen vessel." Lanzi supposed *tular* = τὸ *ollarium*.

No Etruscan phrase has yet been noticed which expresses the sentiment of the Greek μνείας χάριν or μνήμης ἕνεκεν, or of our English "in memory of." But I believe that we have one in the following epitaphs in Lanzi :—

> 76. Thutnei *thui*
>
> 80. Laris Vete *thui*
>
> 313. *Thui* Larth Petrni Larthalisa.

Thui might be interpreted "nominatur, memoratur," by the aid of these Armenian analogies :—

> *thiv* (gen. *thovoy*), "numerus."
>
> *thovel*, "nnmerare."
>
> *thové*, "nnmerat."
>
> *thovi*, "nnmeratur."
>
> *thovich* (plural form of *thovi*), "sententia."

The next epitaph (Lanzi, No. 86) would thus imply that the person named *is commemorated*, and *lived* (i. e. *is dead*) :—

Larth Vete Arnthalisa *thui*. Larth Vete *line*.*

Thovi, it will be seen, being implied in *thovich*, is both a noun and a verb in Armenian ; and in like manner the Etruscan *suthi* would probably signify not only "is buried," but also "grave, tomb." For the following inscription is given by Lanzi (vol. ii, p. 562):—

mi suthi Larthial Muthikus.

"I (am) the tomb of Muthioua the son of Lartia."†

---

* Why should the Latin *line*, "nnge," be considered a probable explanation of this Etruscan *line?*

† We know from Herodotus that the Lydian *Myrsil(us)* meant "the son of *Myrs(us)*."

It might, however, signify: "Muthicas the son of Lartia is haried in me." The stone containing this inscription was discovered at Busca, hetween Cuneo and Saluzzo, in the country of the ancient Vagienni; a remarkahlo locality for an Etruscan epitaph, though it might imply no more than a Greek insoription would do at Rome, or an Eaglish epitaph in a French or Gorman cometery.

In addition to the namerals, the Etruscan epitaphs will have furnished us with the following forms, which I collect togother here. If tho interpretations were nndouhtedly trae, tho Etruscan question might probably he cousidered at an end. Where the Etruscan forms are accompanied hy a numher, it is represented hy N. The proper namo has to he supplied.

$\left.\begin{array}{l} avil\ N \\ avils\ N \end{array}\right\}$ "ætatis N."

ril N, "annos N," or "anno N."

line, "vivebat."

avil ril N, "anno ætatis N."

$\left.\begin{array}{l} ril\ leine\ N \\ ril\ N\ leine \end{array}\right\}$ "vivit annos N."

lupu, "ohit."

$\left.\begin{array}{l} lupu\ avils\ N \\ avils\ N\ lupu \\ avils\ N\ lupuke \end{array}\right\}$ "ohit ætatis N."

zilachnke, "sepelitur."

zilachnke avils N, "sepelitur ætatis N."

zilachnuke lupuke, "sepelitar, ohit."

avils machs N lupu, "obit ætatis mensis (menso) N."

avils thunesi N lupu, "ohit ætatis diei (die) N."

. . *avenke lupum avils machs N*, "deponit cadaver ætatis mensis (mense) N."

eka suthi, "hic conditur."

eka suthi nesl, "hic conditur mortnus."

thui, "memoratur."

tular, "tumulus."

As a companion to the Etruscan epitaphs, whose examination I have now concluded, the longest of the very few Phrygian epitaphs that we possess is here subjoined, with its interpretation from the Armenian:*

Kelokes	*fenaftun*	*aftas*	*materes*	*sosesait,*
Celoces	sepnlcrnm	suæ	matris	facit,

materes	*Efeteksetis*	*Ofefinonoman.*	*Lachit*
matris	Ephetexetis	ex Ofefinone.	{ Sepelit { Vorat

ga	*materan*	*aresastin.*	*Bonok*	*akenanogafos*
terra	matrem	præstantem.	Bonocus	illustris

erekun	*telatos*	*sostut;*	*Inanon*	*akenanogafos,*
usum	{ sepnlcri vetat ; { loci		Inanon	illustris,

aer	*atanisen,*	*kursaneson*	*tanegertos.*
vir	judicialis,	destructionem	ædificii.

Cicero writes (*De Leg.*, ii, 26) : " De sepulcris nihil est apud Solonem amplius, quam 'ne quis ea deleat, neve aliennm inferat'; pœnaqne est, ' si quis bustnm

---

* It was said by Eudoxus (ap. Eustathium) : 'Αρμένιοι τὸ γένος ἐκ Φρυγίας, καὶ τῇ φωνῇ πολλὰ φρυγίζουσιν. As might be expected from a contemporary of Xenophon and Agesilaus, and one who was himself a traveller, Eudoxus is right about language: but the Phrygians probably came from Armenia, not the Armenians from Phrygia.

(nam id pnto appellari τύμβον), aut monumentum, aut columnam violarit, dejecerit, fregerit.'" This passage, as well as ancient epitaphs in general, will shew that the Armenian brings ont a good sonse for the whole of the Phrygian opitaph; in which Bonok may have been the lord of the ground, and Inanon a jndge of the district. Both Bonok and Inanon were *illustres*, or "noblemen," while Ccloces was an untitled man, perhaps a dependent or client of Bonok.

Fenaft-un, "sepulcrum," with an objective termination, is the Armenian *anavth*, or *anóth*, " vessel, pot, box, *arca*, *ἀγγείον*," and probably the Albanian *ouńth*, "a pot."

Aft-as, "suæ," implics *af*, "he," which corresponds to the Knrdish *au*, " this, that," and to the Armenian *iv*, " he," which is fonnd in *ivr*, " of him," and also "his." The genitive of *ivr*, " his," is *ivroy*.

The root of *sosesait*, "facit," may bo discerned, most likely, in the Armenian *šoš*-aphel, " to handle, *manier*"; the compositiou of sosesait (and possibly its root) in the Armenian sar-*as*-el, "to form, tu shape" (root *sar*, in Persian *sdž*); and the conjugation of sosesa*it* in the Armenian t-*ay*, "he gives, *dat*." The Phrygian, like tho Latin, retains the final *t*, which is dropped in Greek, Armenian, and Etruscan, as also in Italian and Spanish.

Ofefinonoman, " ex Ofefinone," has a termination which finds a parallel in the Armenian d*mané*, " from this," and yay*gman*, " in the morning (*ayg*)."

Lachit is a verb of the *i* conjugation, which, if ren-

dered " verat," is explained from the Armenian *laké*,
"he swallows"; and, if rendered " sepelit," contains
the root of the Etruscan zi*lach*nke, which is found in
the Armenian *etag*, " fossa" (*ante*, p. 84).

Ga, " tellus," is the Aryan word which appears in
Greek as γῆ, in Gaelic as *ce*, in German as *gau*, in Sans-
krit as *go*, and in Armenian as *kav*, " clay," and *gav(ar)*,
" province."

Ares-astin, " præstantem," contains the Armenian
yaṟaǧ, "before," *aṟaǧ*, "front," *aṟaǧ-in*, "first," com-
bined with a termination like that of the Armenian nav-
ast, or nav-*asti*, "a sailor." Indeed, *ares-ast-in* might be
obtained from the Armenian *yaṟaǧ-anal*, " præire, to
excel," just as *ovr-ast*, " a denier," is obtained from
ovr-anal, " to deny."

Erek-un, " usum," would contain the Greek ἐργ-,
and the Armenian *erk*, " toil," *herk*, " cultivation."

Aken-anogafos, "illustris," is derived from the same
word as the Armenian *akan-avor*, "illustrious," namely,
akn, "an eye"; and may perhaps contain also the
Armenian *angov*, "worthy of," so as to signify "worthy
of respect, honourable."

Telatos, if interpreted " sepulcri," may be allied to
the Armenian *that-el*, " to bury," and *thatar*, " an
earthen vessel"; and to the Etruscan *tular*, "a tomb":
or, if interpreted "loci," to the Armenian *teti*, "place,"
which seems akin to the root of *thatar*, namely, *that*,
" tellus." The form of *telatos* is just like that of
τέρατος.

Sostut, " vetat," is a verb of the *u* conjugation, and
= Armenian *sasté*, " he reprehends."

Aer (the word is doubtful) seems the Armenian *ayr,* " man."

Atan-isen, "jndicialis," contains the Armenian *atean,* "tribunal, court of justice," and is oquivalent in meaning to the Armenian *aten-akan,* "jndicial, magistrate, judge," or to the Armenian *aten-akal,* "magistrate, senator."

Kursan-eson, " destructionem," is explained from the Armenian *korzan-el,* "to destroy," and *korzanovthivn,* " destruction." The termination *-es-* rather resembles the Armenian *-ič* "-tor," as in *tov-ič,* "giver, da-tor." If *kursaneson* signifies " destroyer" or " injurer," *erekun* ought to signify " nser," not " use."

Tanegert-os, "ædificii," is a compound like *Tigranocerta,* and is composed of the Armenian words, *tovn,* gen. *tan,* " a house," and *kert,* " bnilding."

That *akenanogafos* is a title may be seen also from the epitaph on the tomb of King Midas :—

Ates arkiaefas akenanogafos Midai gafagtaei fanaktei edaes.

Here *arkiaefas* might signify " royal," from tho Armenian *archay,* " king"; or could perhaps be better explained from the Armenian *yarg,* " value, esteem, dignity," *yargi,* " respectable," *yargoy,* " hononrable, precious, reverend." *Gafagtaei* may bo derived from the Armenian *gah,* " throne," and possibly be equivalent to the Armenian *gahakži,* the dative of *gahakiž,* "sharer of a throne, fellow-sovereign"; or else contain the Armenian *gta-nel,* " to acquire, to have." For *fanoktei,* " king," see *infra,* p. 79. *Edaes,* " posnit,"

is a first aorist, like ἔθηκε or ἔζησε, while the Arme-
nian *ed*, "posuit," is a second aorist, like ἔθη. The
terminations of the Armenian first aorist active, in the
third person singular, are *-eaž* and *-až*, according to
the conjugation. It usually wants the augment; but
in *e-k-eaž*, "he lived," and *e-b-až*, "he opened," we
meet with forms completely like the Phrygian *e-d-aes*,
"posuit." *Edaes* terminates two other short inscrip-
tions, so that its meaning is clear.

I have already noticed the identity of the Phrygian
ἔλυμος, "αὐλός," with the Armenian *etégn*, "reed."
Another Phrygian plant-name was *remenia*, "*hyoscy-
amus*, henbane," which is merely mentioned in my
Armenian dictionary as "a poisonous plant." But *-ení*
forms names of trees in Armenian, as in *keraseni*, "a
cherry-tree"; and the same language has *ṛem-akal*
= *okh-akal*, "malignant," and therefore implicitly *ṛem*
= *okh*, "malice." Yet the nearest word to *remenia* is
the Sanskrit *ramaṇíya*, "pleasant, a charm," of which
the root is *rám*, "love, delight." Henbane may have
been used in philtres. An almost synonymous Sanskrit
word, *priya*, "gratus," might explain the first element
of the Dacian πρια-δήλα, "ἄμπελος μέλαινα," of which
the second element, δήλα, is the Armenian *det*, "herb,
medicine." The Phrygian σοῦσα, "λείρια," is obviously
Semitic, but may have been derived immediately from
the Armenian *souśan*, "lily." Ζέλκια, the Phrygian for
λάχανα, resembles more than one Armenian word: as
ẓatik (in composition *ẓatk-*), "flower"; *ẓatk*, "stalk";
setkh, "melon," = Albanian *śalkyi*. The relics of the

Lydian language supply us with two names of the
same kind. One is ἄκυλον, "βάλανον πρινίνην," which
may be compared with the German *eichel*, and the
Armenian *katin*, "acorn." The other is μυσός, "ὀξύη,
beech"; a word which seems allied to the Abkhasian
miĉa, "wood"; to the Sanskrit *miĉata*, "sandal-wood";
and to the Armenian *mośay*, "tamarisk." The name
of *Mysia* was supposed to be derived from μυσός. If
we may trust Homer, the tamarisk was common in the
Troad (*Il.*, vi. 39; x. 466; xxi. 18, 350). Herodotus
mentions it in Lydia (vii. 31), where Mr. Hamilton
(vol. ii, p. 144) speaks of "thickets of tamarisk."
There was a *Mæsia Silva* in Etruria, not far from
Rome. The Proper Thracian supplies us with three
plant-names. Βρίζα was the name of a plant like τίφη,
of which the thema is τῖφος, "marsh, stagnant water."
The Sanskrit *vrihi*, and the Armenian *brinẑ*, "rice,"
and the Rhæto-Romance *ritscha*, "grass growing in
water," would be akin to βρίζα. The second Thracian
plant-name is κῆμος, "ὄσπριόν τι." The Sanskrit has
kâmin, "a climbing plant," and the Tuschi has *kam*,
= Georgian *kama*, "dill." The Bessi supply the third
Thracian plant-name, ἀσᾶ, "βήχιον, tussilago, colts-
foot," which is plainly allied to the Armenian *haz*,
Sanskrit *kâsa*, "βήξ, tussis"; and, as the Germans
call "coltsfoot" huf-*lattich*, the Armenian *hazar*, "let-
tuce," might also be compared with *haz* and *ἀσᾶ*.
The change of the Sanskrit *kâsa* into the Armenian
haz is like the change, in Florentine pronunciation, of
casa into χasa or *hasa*. Professor Max Müller has

noticed the apparent affinity of the Dacian *μαντεἱα*, "*sentis, rubus,* bramble, blackberry," to the Albanian; in which language we find *man, mandë,* "a mulberry, a mulberry-tree," *mandë pherrë (pherrë,* "bramble"), "a blackberry." In Armenian we have, according to Rivola, *mandak,* "genus herbæ"; and there is likewise the Armenian *man-anekh,* "mustard," and the Ossetic *män-ärth,* "a raspberry, *rubus idæus.*" Perhaps the original meaning of *man-, mand-,* or *μαντ-,* is "berry"; and the root may appear in the Sanskrit *mandala,* "orbis, circuitus," and in the Armenian *man,* "a round," which is also found in the expression *man pttoz̄,* "blossom of fruits *(pttoz̄).*" All these words might have belonged to a race who spoke dialects closely allied to the Sanskrit, as the Armenian is, and who proceeded from a country in the position of Armenia. The Dacian plant-names (*ante,* pp. 8, 9) have exhibited still more striking Armenian affinities.

CHAPTER III.

ETRUSCAN VOTIVE INSCRIPTIONS.

THE principle on which the argument in the preceding
chapter has been conducted is, to determine in general
the sense of each word without regard to its sound or
form, and then to see what language or languages can
explain that sense. This was possible in epitaphs, but
is not so in votive forms of expression, or at least not
so readily and completely. The shortest and, I think,
the best mode of proceeding here will be, to exhibit at
once the interpretations at which I have arrived, and
then to prove their correctness, or at least their fit-
ness.* I shall begin therefore by laying before the
reader the three longest Etruscan votive inscriptions,
accompanied by the interpretations which I put upon
them. The first is on a statue, now at Leyden (Micali,
Mon., tav. XLIII; Lanzi, vol. ii, p. 455). It runs thus:—

Velias Fanaknal   thuf-lthas   alpan   lenache
Veliæ Fanacia-natæ signum-precis supplex facessit

   klen   kecha   tuthines   tlen-acheis.
   pia   expiat   gratiæ   debitum-pretinm.

All the terms used here will be subsequently ex-

---

* The other or analytical process was adopted in my *Armenian
Origin of the Etruscans* (1861).

plained. The proper name, *Fanak*, deserves observation, on account of its resemblance to the Phrygian *fanaktei* (*ante*, p. 74), = Greek ἄνακ-τι, and of the connexion of those words with the Armenian *nakh*, "first," and with the *naqa*, "king," of the Persian inscriptions. In the Milesian traditions reported by Pausanias, *Anax*, = Armenian *nakh*, "first," is the Autochthon and the son of Earth (*Ge*). Ἄναξ would be a Thracian, not a Hellenic word: at least it is Armenian, and is not Latin. The father of St. Gregory, the Apostle of Armenia, was said to be a Parthian called *Anak*.

The next long inscription, on the base of the statue of "the Orator" in the Uffizi at Florence (Micali, *Mon.*, tav. xliv; Lanzi, vol. ii, p. 468), is as follows:—

Aulesi	*Metelis*	*Ve.*	*Vesial*	*klensi ken*
Aulus	Metellus	Veli filius	Vesia-natus	pius ut
fleres	*teke*	*sansl*	*tenine tuthines chiseliks.**
donum	ponit	libens	fert gratiae monumentum.

The proper name, *Vesia*, may be compared with the Armenian *wés*, "superbus." *Ken*, "ut," seems found in the Armenian *kén*, which is, however, only employed in composition. There are in Armenian two triads of terms signifying "as, like":—

or-bar, or-pés, or-kén——hi-bar, hi-pés, hi-kén.

Or signifies "who, which," and so would *hi*, which the Armenian *him*, "quare," = Sanskrit *kim*, "quare," shews to be identical with the Sanskrit *ki*, "who,

---

* In the original, *chisvliks*. I have changed the *v* (F) into *s* (E), as in the case of *tivrs*, "thirty."

which," = Albanian *kyë*. *Bar* means "modus" in
Armenian, and -*pés* = Sanskrit *peça*, "forma." All
the six terms above therefore signify "quomodo"; and
kén may thus be interpreted " nt."

The following is the third long votive inscription,
and accompanies a statue of Apollo (Lanzi, vol. ii, p.
446 :—

> *mi   fleres   Epul   (a)fe   Aritimi*
> mo   donum   Apollini   et   Artemidi
>
> *Fasti   R(u)fr(u)a   turke   klen   kecha.*
> Fausta Rufria   dat   pia   oxpiat.

Afe, "and," would be identical with the Armenian
ev, "and," which Bötticher refers to the Sanskrit
abhi, "ad, versus," = Greek *ἐπί*. But the word is
doubtful, and is not found elsewhere. Fabretti reads
svulare instead of *Epul afe*.

On a candelabrum (Lanzi, vol. ii. p. 421) there is
also this expression :—

> *Au.   Velskus   thup-lthas   alpan   turke.**
> Aulus Veliscus   signum-precis supplex dat.

I will next give a complete list of Etruscan votive
forms, omitting proper names, and reversing in three
instances, for the sake of comparison, the order in
which two words occur. The list would be this :—

---

* *Alpan turke* terminates two other votive forms. Fabretti,
1051, 1052. In the Etruscan *kecha*, "expiat," *turke*, "dat,"
suthi, "conditur," and *lupu*, "obit," we have examples of the
four Armenian conjugations in *a, e, i,* and *u* (*ov*); as in the
Armenian *tay*, "gives," *ató*, "hates," *lini*, "is," and *lizov*, "licks."
Three of the four appear in the Phrygian *sosesait, lachit,* and
sostut (*ante*, pp. 72, 73).

1. *kana*
2. *suthina*
3. *flezrl*
4. *fleres* ....*tlen-asies*
5. *fleres-zek* .... *sansl*
6.   *turuke*
7. *fleres   turke*
8. *fleres   turke   klen   kecha*
9. *alpan thup-lthas turke*   [*achcis*
10. *alpan thuf-lthas lenache klen   kecha tuthines tlen-*
11. *klensi fleres   teke   sansl tenine tuthines chise-*
                                                        [*liks*

The next step in the argument will be to give the
meaning of these words, as deduced mainly from the
Armenian ; and to show, as in the case of sepulchral
expressions, that such meanings make Etruscan votive
forms correspond in sense to the forms used by the
ancients. I therefore subjoin this comparative list of
ancient votive terms :—

LATIN & GREEK.	ETRUSCAN.
Εἰκών	*kana*, " simulacrum, statua."
Ἄγαλμα	*zek*, " statna, figura."
Ἀνάθημα	*suthina*, " sacrificium."
Εὐχῆς ἕνεκα	*thup-lthas*, " signum-precis."
Ex voto	*fleres*, " donum."
Donum	*flezrl*, " datum."
Votum	
Libens	*sansl*, " libens."
	klen, klensi, " pius."
	alpan, " supplex, ἱκέτης."

G

LATIN & GREEK.	ETRUSCAN.
ἀνέθηκε	*tenine,* "fert."
Posuit	*teke,* "ponit," or "facit."
Retulit	
Fecit	*lenache,* "facessit, fieri facit."
Dedit	*turke,* "dat."
Solvit	*kecha,* "expiat," or "solvit."
Dedicavit	
Consecravit	
Χαριστήρια	*tuthines chiseliks,* "gratiæ monumentum."
Merito	*tuthines tlen-acheis,* "gratiæ debitum-[pretium."
	tlen-asies, ... dobitum-[pretium."

The meanings assigned to the Etruscan words are
thus suitable, and therefore likely to be true; and this
probability may be still further shown by the following
inscription, which is found in Gruter, p. xlvii :—

To *precor** Alcido *sacris* invicte *peractis*
Rite† tuis *lætus dona ferens meritis*‡
Hæc tibi nostra potest tenuis perferre camina
Nam *grates dignas*§ tu potes efficere
Sumo *libens‖ simulacra*¶ tuis quæ *munera*** cilo
Aris Urbanus *dedicat*†† ipso sacris.

I shall now show how the meanings assigned to the

Etruscan words are obtained, almost entirely from the Armenian :—

Kana (1) " simulacrum" (Lanzi, vol. ii, pp. 465, 466). Gaelic *caon*, " simulacrum ;" or Armenian *k-al*, " sistere," *-an*, Armenian termination, = Sanskrit *-ana*. *Kana* is found on statues.

Suthina (2), " sacrificium."

Tuthines (10, 11), " gratiæ, donationis, χάριτος." These words are of the utmost significance. *Suthina* is found alone on a number of objects ; among others, on a statue (Micali, *Mon.*, tav. xxxv, 9), and on the back of a patera (tav. xlviii) : it is also sometimes accompanied by a proper name (Fabretti, p. clxxxiii). The most probable meaning of *suthina* is obviously " a votive offering ;" and it would therefore be duly explained from the Sanskrit *hu*, "Diis offerre, sacrificare," just as the Etruscan *suth-i*, " is buried," was explained from the Sanskrit *hud*, " coacervare, submergi" (*ante*, p. 62). Though it would seem probable, at first sight, that *suthi* and *suthina* were cognate words, yet they need be no more so than *potis* and *potio ; lot, lotus*, and *lotion ; rat* and *ration*. We may also fairly conclude that *suthina* does not mean " tomb" or " urn ;" for such an inscription as *Larth Seties suthina* is found on *several* vases, " in *nonnullis* vasis" (Fabretti, 2095 *quinq. B*). The ashes of a deceased person would not be distributed among a number of vases : nor, indeed, does there seem any sense but " votive offering" which will explain the fact of *suthina* being found as a single word on statues, pateræ, and, as in Fabretti, *quinq. A*,

" in nonnullis monumentis abeneis," discovered at one
place. As therefore *suthi* appears on tombs, it is pro-
bable that *suthi* and *suthina* have no etymological con-
nexion ; and it is also probable that, while *suthina* is a
nominative, *tuthines* is the genitive of a similar nomina-
tive *tuthina*, where the termination is the same as that
of *suthina*, but the root different, just as we find in
Latin *natio* and *ratio*, *motio* and *notio*. We should thus
have these words in Etruscan :—

   su-thina, or else *s(u)-uthina*, " sacrificium."
   tu-thina, or else *t(u)-uthina*, " . . . ."

In the termination *-uthina*, an Armenian would at
once recognise his native termination *-ovthivn*, which
is so common as to occur three times in the Lord's
Prayer, as well as in twelve nouns derived from *nav*,
" a ship," and in fifteen derived from *mard*, " a man."
The Sanskrit *hu*, "Diis offerre, sacrificare," becomes the
Armenian *zoh*, which would be *suh* in Etruscan ortho-
graphy ; while the root of the Etruscan *t(u)-uthina* or
t-uthina is found in the Armenian *tov* or *t-*, " give ;"
for "d-are" is *t-al*, and " d-atus" is *tov-eal*, in Ar-
menian. We have, indeed, both the Etruscan words
in Armenian : for " bnman *sacrifice*" is marda-*zohov-
thivn*, and " *giving* of homage" is barka-*tovovthivn*, in
that language.

The final vowel in *suthin-a* would be dropped in Ar-
menian, as may be seen by such an instance as *kin*,
" γυνή," with which may be compared the Etruscan
kina, that occurs in the beginning of an inscription at
Volterra :—

Titesi Kalesi kina Ks Mestles.....

The Etruscan proper name, *Mestles*, resembles the name of the Mæonian leader, Μέσθλης (Il. π, 864), and that of the Iberian town, Μεστλῆτα, mentioned by Ptolemy. *Mes-* may be the Armenian *mez*, " great," = Zend *mazô*, = Sanskrit *mah(at)*, another example of the change of the Sanskrit *h* into a sibilant.

The following table will exhibit the affinity between the Armenian and Etruscan in several points already considered ; and may likewise explain, to some extent, by showing in what manner the Armenian uses infinitives and participles as nouns, how the Etruscan comes to have so many *l* terminations :—

ARMENIAN ROOTS & WORDS.	ETRUSCAN ROOTS & WORDS.
sovz, " cond-ere."	*suth*, = Sanskrit *hud*.
zoh, " sacrifice."	*su*, = Sanskrit *hu*.
tov, " give."	*tu*.
av, "age, increase."	*av*, = Sanskrit *av*.
rah, " go."	*ri*, = Sanskrit *ri*.
tes, " sight."	
tes-ové, gen. *tes-éi*, "inspector."	
tes-avor, " apparent."	
tes-il (videri), "appearance."	*av-il*, "age."
tes-avor-il, " to appear."	*r(i)-il*, " year."
tes-an-el, " to see."	
tes-an-el, " appearance."	
tes-ot (videns), "prophet."	
tes-an-ot (videns), " prophet."	
tes-ovthivn, " sight."	*s(u)-uthina*, "sacrificium."
tes-é-ovthivn, "inspection."	*t(u)-uthines*, "donationis."

tes-an-el-ovthivn, "visibility."

tes-ot-ovthivn, "sight."

tes-an-ot-ovthivn, "sight."

tes-an-eli, "visurus, videndus."

tesanelich, "the eyes, sight."

These last two Armenian forms will illustrate in its place the Etruscan *chiseliks.*

> *Flezrl* (3), "datum."
>
> *Fleres* (4, 5, 7, 8, 11), "donum."

I have met with *flezrl* only once : it occurs on the back of a statue (Micali, *Mon.,* tav. xxxiii). The analogy of *fleres* would lead us to expect *flerzl* instead of *flezrl,* while we should infer from *nesl,* "mortuus," that *flezrl* or *flerzl* is probably a participle. On a patera in Lanzi (tav. xi), a pedestal with a bust is inscribed *flere.* The connexion with *fleo* and *ploro* is most likely a correct one. The Armenian gives:—*eter,* "fletns" —*aters,* "precis"—*ovterz,* "donum"—and *eterzeal, otorzeal,* and *ovterzeal,* "datus, oblatus." The initial vowels here may be due to the circumstance, that few Armenian words are allowed to begin with *t,* = $\chi\lambda$, = Welsh *ll,* which the English pronunciation converts into *thl* or *fl.* The Armenian *etag (ante,* p. 34) is an instance of a vowel being prefixed to *t.* The *f* in *fleres* may represent the aspirate χ contained in *t.* But compare also the Armenian *lov,* "flea, floh," where *f* before *l* is entirely dropped. In *li,* "$\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}$-os," *p* is dropped.

> *Tlen-asies* (4)
> *Tlen-acheis* (10) } "debitum pretinm."

Gaelic *dligh,* "debe ;" *dlighe,* "lex, debitum ;" *dleas,*

" officium ;" root *dl-*, in Etruscan *tl-* : *-ean*, Armenian adjectival termination.

Armenian *azéch*, " pretium," a plural noun : in the objective, the final *-ch* becomes *-s*. Ossetic *achos* " a aum due ;" *achźa*, " money." Greek ἀξία. Compare *ach*eis and *as*ies with the two Armenian forms for " daughter," do*kh*t and dov*s*tr.

Turuke (6)
Turke (7, 8, 9) } " dat. δωρεῖ."

Armenian *tovrch*, " gift," a plural noun, of which the root or base is *tovr* : it ia found in *phaŗ-a-trê*, " he gives glory (*phaŗ*)." As already noticed, a great many Etruscan verbs aeem to terminate in *-ke*, liko *tur-ke ;* a form apparently used by the Lydians, as the Lydian βάσκε, " ἐξεθόαζε," would = the Armonian *waz-êr*, " he was rushing." Anothor oxamplo of such a form is supplied by the picturo which forms tho frontispioce to the second volumo of Mr. Dennia' *Etruria*. It repre-aents the self-devotion of Alcestia to death for her husband, and is accompanied by this inscription ;—

eka erske nak achrum flerthrke.

Eka has already been interpreted " here" or " *ecce*," from tho Armenian *ahá*, "lo !" The Georgiau has *aha*, " ecce ;" *ach*, "hic ;" and *acha*, " ibi." *Ers-ke*, as we know the subject of the picture, may be considored as equivalent to the Armenian *eres-ê*, " aho offers herself." *Nak* may mean " to," liko tho German *nach*, the Hun-garian *nak*, and the Tuschi *naqw ;* and a aimilar word would appear in the Armenian *nakh*, " first, bofore," which is both adjective and adverb, and has in com-position nearly the force of the Gorman *nach*, as in the

Armenian *nakhanz*, "envy." And thus, as *fler-thrke*
would he already explained under *fleres* (p. 86) and
turke (p. 87), the whole inscription would probably
mean: "Lo! she offers herself to Acheron as a de-
voted (or 'suppliant') gift." As a comparison of forms,
notice that *thrke* elides the vowel in *turke*, as the Ar-
menian *srbé*, "ho sanctifies," elides the vowel *ov*, = *u*,
in *sovrb*, "holy," = Sanscrit *çubhra*, "splendidns,
albus." Compare the Sabine *cyprum*, "bonnm," and
the Etruscan *Cypra*, "Juno," which would he a Sabine
word.

   Zek (5), "statua, figura."

Armenian *žev*, *ževak*, "form, figure." *Zek* might
likewise ho rendered "hrought," from the Armenian
žgel, = German *ziehen;* or "produced," from the
Armenian *žagel*, = German *zeugen*. Perhaps *zek*,
which only occurs ouce, should he *zeke*, "hrings," =
Armenian *žgé*.

   Sansl (5, 11), "libens."

Armenian *žnžavt*, *žnžót*, or *žnžot*, "gaudens,
libens." Tho inscriptiou (5), when completed, is: *fleres
zek(e) sansl kver*.   It is found on the statue of a boy.
I should intorprot *kver*, "soror," guided by snch Latin
inscriptions as :—

D.M.C. Egnatio Epicteto et C. Egnatio Floro
modesta *soror*.

Fortunato fratri pientissimo fecerunt *sorores*.

Tho Armeniun for "sister" is *choyr*, which is pro-
nounced like tho English *queer*, and gives *cher* in the
genitive.   The Persian is *khwáher;* the Welsh, *chwaer;*

and the Breton, *choar*. On another statue of a boy,
with the inscribed arm unfortunately nearly broken off
(Micali, *Mon.*, tav. XLIV), is this fragment of an inscription :—

> . . . . . as velusa
> . . . . . is kelvansl
> . . . . . s *kver* thvethli
> . . . . . klan

As the Etruscan *Thanchvil* is the Latin *Tanaquil*, the
Etruscan *kver* would probably be represented by *quer*
in Latin. In the votive inscription, fleres tlen-asies
sver, sver may = *kver*, as tlen-asies seems = tlen-ach*eis*
(*ante*, p. 86).

If the Etruscan *sansl* and *nesl* be "libens" and
"necatus," and if *avil* and *ril* be infinitives as well as
nouns, we should find these terminations in four
languages :—

	ETRUSCAN.	ARMENIAN.	PERSIAN.	SANSKRIT.
Infinitive ...	-*l*	-*l*	-*dan*	-*tuṁ*
Pres. Part....	-*l*	-*t*	-*n*	-*(n)t*
Past. Part....	-*l*	-*l*	-*dah*	-*ta*

The Lydian καυδαύλ(ης) would exhibit the present participle in a third Thracian dialect (*ante*, p. 7).

Klen (8, 10) } "pius, rito," i.e. "with due religious
Klensi (11) }   rites."

For the termination of *klensi*, which distinguishes it
from *klen*, compare the Armenian *layn* and *laynśi*,
"broad ;" or *bolor*, " a circle," and *bolorśi*, "round ;"
and for the meaning of *klen*, compare the Gaelic *glan*
and the Welsh *glân*, *glain*, "pure, holy, *clean*, beau-

tiful, fair;" and perhaps the Armenian *getani*, "fair, decent."

On a tomb at Vulci (Micali, *Mon. Ined.*, tav. LIX) the sculptured figure of a man stands in a rock-hewn blank doorway, and is surrounded by an inscription which may be interpreted as follows :—

> *Eka suthik   Velus   Ezpus   klensi kerinu*
> "Hic tumulum Velus Ezpus pius   sculpit."

For *suthik* may be considered as a diminutive of *suthi*, "a tomb" (*ante*, p. 69), like the Armenian *masnik*, "a particle," from *masn*, "a part;" or *lovsik*, "a little light," from *loys*, "light." *Ker-in-u*, like *lup-u* (*ante*, p. 33), would be an Armenian verb of the *ov* or *u* conjugation, derived from a root *ker*, which may be allied to *cher-el*, "to scrape," or *gër-el*, "to write," or *kër-el*, "to hammer, to carve." For the *-in*- in *kerinu*, compare Armenian forms like *lizanē, lizē, lizov, lezov*, "he licks"—*gotanay, gotē*, "he steals"—*kheranay, kheri*, "he insults"—*kamenay, kami*, "he wishes." Similar *n* forms are common in Aryan languages. *Lini*, "he is," supplies another instance in Armenian.

Kecha (8, 10), "expiat, consecrat," or also "solvit."

Armenian *chahē*, "expiat"——*chakē*, "solvit." There is also *kahē*, "parat." See *ante*, p. 37, No. 2340: *klalum ke* . . . , "funera . . . . ."

Tenine (11), "fert, offert."

Armenian *tani*, "fert, reddit, *tenet*." *Ten-in-e* would be a form like *ker-in-u*, just noticed, but in an *e*, not a *u* conjugation. The simpler form is *tenu* (*ante*, p. 36,

note †). Compare tho Armenian *psnov*, = *psnĕ*, = *psĕ*, "he considers."

Alpan (9, 10), "supplex, ἱκέτης, flehend."

Armenian *otb*, "fletus:" -*an*, -*ean*, Armenian adjectival terminations. Tho letters *o* and *b* are wanting in Etruscan.

Teke (11), "facit," or elso "ponit."

Lapponic *takk-et*, Fin *tek-ä*, "facere." Sanskrit *taks*, "facere, fabricare, findere;" *taksan*, "faber lignarius." Armenian *thak*, "a hammer, a mallet;" *thak-el*, "to beat, to ram." Latin *tignum, tigillum.* Greek τέκτων, τέχνη.

Te-ke might also be regarded as an Etruscan verb in -*ke* from a root *t-* "placing." This Aryan root is in Armenian *d-*, and *dë-nĕ* is "ponit," an *n* form like the Etruscan *ten-ine* and *ker-inu.*

Thup-lthas (9)
Thuf-lthas (10) } "signum precis, an *ex voto*."

Τύπος λιτῆς. Armenian *tophel, thopel, dophel,* "τύπτειν"——*atŏthel*, "precari;" *itż*, "desiderium;" *ĕtżal*, "desiderare." Though the Armenian avoids *t* as an initial, yet we find *tżali*, as well as *ĕtżali*, "desiderandus." Τύπος illustrates *teke* by exhibiting the connexion between "striking," and "forming" or "making." As τύπος and λιτή are not Latin (for *typus* is borrowed), they would be Thracian rather than Hellenic words, if the Hellenes were an offshoot of the same Italian race to which the Umbrians and Oscans belonged.

Lenache (10), "facessit."

Armenian *etanaké*, "modulatur;" *etanak*, "modus, forma;" *etanil* "fieri;" *linel*, "esse, fieri, existere." There is, besides, the suffix *-etén*, "fac(tus)," as in *osketén*, "made of gold *(oski)*".* In Armenian, the termination *-ak* is frequently causative, like the Sanskrit *-aka*: e.g. *é*, "existence;" *éak*, "creator;" so that, as *lin-el* is "fieri," *lin-aké* would be "fieri facit." If *lenache* be "facessit," *teke* would be "ponit" rather than "facit."

Chiseliks (11), "monumentum, in memoriam."

Armenian *yiśelich*, "a memorial," the plural form of *yiśeli*, of which the diminutive would be *yiśelik* (a form like the Etruscan *suthik*), and its plural form *yiśelikch*, in the objective *yiśeliks*. *Yiśeli* is the future participle of *yiśel*, "to remember," of which the root is *yiś*. Similar forms to *yiśelich* are:—*talich*, "gift," *lselich*, "ear, audience," *ēmpelich*, "beverage," and *tesanelich*, "sight, eyes" (*ante*, p. 86). But the existing Armenian forms derived from the root *khat*, "playing," will most clearly exemplify the supposed formation of *chiseliks* from a root *chis*.

ARMENIAN.	ETRUSCAN.
khat, "ludus."	*chis*
khatal, "ludere."	
khatali, "ludendus."	
khatalich, "ludus," i.e. "ludenda."	
khatalik, "ludus" (dimin.)	
khataliks, "ludos."	*chiseliks*

For the affinity between the Etruscan *chis* and the Armenian *yiś*, compare the Armenian *khorzel*, *yovzel*,

---

* Cf. Lithuanian *auksas*, Prussian *ausis*.

"to seek." The Armonian *y* is aspirated.* In the mountains of Noricum there was a place called *Cand-alicæ*, which resembles the Armenian *khat-alik* in form, and which may, by the aid of tho root *cand*, "throttlo" (*ante*, p. 7), be interpreted "gorgos," or "étrangle-ments." Tho Albanian has *ersëli*, "honourable" (th. *ers*, "honour"), to compare with tho Armenian *yargeli*, "venerandus." On the Noric *Elegium*, see *ante*, p. 66.

I have now completely gono through the votive words comprised in the forms at the beginning of the chapter (*ante*, p. 81). A few other words may be added to them. Tho first is the well-known *Tins-kvil*, which stands alono on threc votivo offerings (one of them the celebrated Chimæra), and in which the namo of *Tina*, the Etruscan Jupitor, has long boen recognised. *Tina* wonld be the Sanskrit *dina*, "day," a contraction of *divana* (Lassen) = *divan*, "day." The root is *div*, "to shino," which appears in the Armenian *tiv*, "day," in the Latin *dies, divum, divinus*, and, as already noticed, in the Albanian *diel* or *dil*, "the sun." It may be remarked here in passing, how the Albanian *vëlazër*, "brother," (which the plural shows to be tho complete form of *vëla*, "brother"), enables us to pass from the Sanskrit *bhrátri* to the Armenian *etbayr*, for *btayr*.

The Etruscan *kvil* in *Tins-kvil* seems = Armenian *khilay*, "gift;" which would make *Tinskvil* signify "Jovis donnm, Jupiter's gift, a gift to Jupiter."

This word is found, together with some others, on

<hr>

* We have also the Etruscan *kiem, chiem*, "five," to pnt by the sido of the Armenian *hing*, "five," and *yi-sovn*, "fif-ty."

the beautiful candelabrum of Cortona. The inscription, which has slightly suffered from a fracture, appears to have run thus :—

> *thapna lusni (T)inskvil Athli(i) sulthn*

As *Ath* and *Athl* are both proper names in Etruscan (Lanzi, tom. II, p. 363 :—there is an Armenian district called *Athli*), the meaning of the inscription may be—

> "A burner of light, offered to Tina, the work
> of Atilius."

Thapna, "καύστης,"—*lusni*, "luminis,"—and *salthn*, "cast, fonte, formatie, opus," may be thus explained :

1. Sanskrit *tap*, "burn," = Armenian *tap, thaph* : Sanskrit svap*na*, "sleep ;" Armenian mas*n*, "part," ot*n*, "foot."

2. Armenian *loys*, "light ;" *lovsin*, gen. *lovsni*, "the moon ;"* *lovsn-thag* ("light-crown"), "the planet Jupiter."

3. *Salthn* might be explained either from the Armenian *sat-mn*, "an embryo," or from the Armenian *sat-el*, "to mix, to knead." The termination *-thn* may be a contraction of *-ovthivn (ante,* p. 84). In *form*, *salthn* resembles the Armenian *sovrthn*, " orifice."†

---

* On a patera or mirror in Lanzi (tav. XII, No. 6) Diana is called *Losna*, a name remarkable for containing the non-Etruscan vowel o.

† The Etruscan *kech-* (*ante*, p. 90) and the Armenian *chah-* (or *chav-*; cf. Sanskrit *khav*, " purificari") would explain two words in Hesychius, of which the last might exhibit the *l* termination of the Armenian, Lydian, and Etruscan present participle (*ante*, p. 89):—

> Κ*ο*ί(ης) or κό(ης), " *ἱερεὺς* Καβείρων *ὁ καθαίρων φονέα*."
> Κοιδλ(ης), " *ἱερεὺς*."

CHAPTER IV.

THE INSCRIPTION OF CERVETRI.

In the two previous chapters, which have been devoted
to the consideration of sepulchral and votive forms in
Etruscan, the force of the argument is in a great
measure derived from the fact, that the Armenian
language enables us to explain the Etruscan words in
such a manner as to make the sense of the Etruscan
forms correspond closely to that of other ancient forms
of the same kinds. The meaning assigned to the
Etruscan words may sometimes be described as certain,
as in the cases of *avil, ril,* and *leine,* and may be
generally affirmed as more or less probable in every
case; so that the argument in favour of the Armenian
or Thracian affinities of the Etruscan becomes very
strong. In the subject of the present chapter, there
are no such analogies to guide us : there is no sense
which we are bound to elicit from the Etruscan by the
aid of the Armenian, if the intimate relationship be-
tween the two languages is to be maintained. That
the inscription of Cervetri is Armenian, depends chiefly
upon the singular closeness with which the Armenian
fits it, and which is such that even the metre of the
inscription, for it is written in verse, scarcely suffers at

all, while a good and appropriate sense is brought out for it at the same time.

The Inscription of Cervetri, the ancient *Agylla* or *Cœre*, is written on a pot or cup of antique black ware, capable of holding nearly a pint ; and it consists of two hexameter verses, but with the words all run together. They should probably be divided thus:—

mi ni kethu ma mi mathu mar am lisiai thipurenai
ethe erai sie epana mi nethu nastav helephu.

As it might be objected that the lines are divided into words so as to adapt them to the Armonian, it may be as well to mention that my division of them is the same as that of Lepsius, with the exception that he reads *maram* instead of *mar am* in the first line, and *minethu* instead of *mi nethu* in the second, where I follow Dr. Donaldson. *Maram* may perhaps be preferable to *mar am*, as will ultimately appear : but, if we read *mi ni kethu* and *mi mathu* with Lepsius, then *mi nethu* seems more probable than *minethu*. As we have already met with *mi*, " I," in Etruscan, it may reasonably be conjectured that the cup is made to speak of itself, and that it affirms of *muthu* what it denies of *kethu*. Again, as the Etruscan is an Aryan language, it will be at once suspected that *mathu* means " wine," for such a word occurs in a great number of Aryan dialects, from the English *mead* to the Sanskrit *madhu*.

With this slight clue to the tenor of the inscription, I will now proceed to interpret it word for word, as I have divided it :—

1. *Mi*, "I."

The Armenian for "I" is *es*; for "me," (*z*)*is*: but *me*, "I," and *me*, "me," exist implicitly in the Armenian plurals, *mech*, "wo" (= Lithuanian *més*), and (*z*)*mez*, "ns." For *dov*, "thou," makes *dovch*, "ye"; and the Armenian nominative plural is formed by the addition of -*ch* to the singular, and the accusative plural by that of -*s*.

Welsh and Gaelic *mi*, "I"; Georgian *me*, "I": etc.

2. *Ni*, "not."

Armenian *mi* = Greek μή = Latin *ne*.

Welsh and Gaelic *ni*, "not." Behistun Persian *niya*, "not." Persian *mah*, *nah*, "not."

3. *Kethu*, "of water"; less probably, "of milk."

The Armenian *get*, "river," *kath*, "drop," *kith*, "milking," and *kathn*, "milk," are thus declined:—

Nominativo......*get**	*kath*	*kith*	*kathn*.
Genitive ....*getoy*	*kathi*	*kthoy*	*kathin*.
Dative ....*getoy*	*kathi*	*kthoy*	*kathin*.
Ablative ....*getoy*	*kathé*	*kthoy*	*kathiné*.
Instrumental ...*getow*	*kathiv*	*kthow*	*kathamb*.

There is in Etruscan prose a remarkable deficiency of vowels, which does not appear in the Inscription of Cervetri; a difference which has led to the inference that the language of the Inscription of Cervetri is not Etruscan.† But this inference is too hasty, for the

---

* Armenian infinitives are declined completely, like *get*.

† "This (the Inscription of Cervetri) is neither Latin, nor Greek, nor Umbrian, nor Oscan. It is equally certain that it is not Etruscan ; since in that tongue harsh unions of consonants

same peculiarity exists in Armenian, where the vowel
ĕ, which has the same sound as the Sanskrit *a*, is
continually understood in prose, where it would be
expressed in poetry.   Author says of this Armenian
letter : " Entre deux ou plusieurs consonnes elle est
toujours sousentendue ; mais dans la division des
mots *elle se met actuellement, comme aussi dans la
poésie.*"   Sir Henry Rawlinson, in his explanation of
the Persian Cuneiform Inscriptions (p. 55), writes :
" The short sound of *a* was *optionally* inherent in all
the consonants of the (ancient) Persian alphabet.   This
principle of organisation is common to every single
branch of Arian Palæography, with the exception of
the Zend."   The Armenians and Etruscans exercised
such an option by dropping in prose the short *a*,
= Armenian *ĕ*, while the Phrygians preferred ex-
pressing it.   In Sanskrit, the short *a* is *necessarily*
implied in every consonant or combination of con-
sonants, when unaccompanied by the mark *Virâma*, or
the sign of some other vowel.

An Etruscan word where the deficiency of vowels is
particularly great is *trutnvt*, which seems in a bi-
lingual inscription (Lanzi, vol. ii. p. 565) to correspond
to *haruspex*, and may be composed of the root or base

---

abound, while in this the distribution of vowels is as well propor-
tioned as in the Negro-languages : moreover none of the well-
known Etruscan words here occur."—Newman's *Regal Rome*, p. 7.
Mi, " I, me," does occur in the Inscription of Cervetri : nor is there
any reason why two verses on a drinking-cup should contain any
votive or sepulchral words.

of *trutinor*, with the Armenian termination *-ovaz*,
= Sanskrit and Zend *-vat*. But though in *trutnvt* there
is only one vowel to six consonants, yet the same pro-
portion is observed in two Armenian words of similar
sound : in *trtnǵel*, " to murmur," and in *θrθnǵuk*,
" sorrol," gen. *θrθnǵki*.* In two of the Armenian
words cited above to explain the Etruscan *kethu*, namely
kthoy and *kthow*, there is an *ë* deficient, and they
would be written in poetry *këthoy* and *këthow;* or in
Etruscan orthography, as the Etruscans had no *o*,
kethu in both cases. *Getoy* and *getow* would become
in like manner *ketu*, as the Etruscans had no medial
consonants.

Gaelic *cith, gith*, " imber"; *cè*, gen. *cèithe*, " flos
lactis." Albanian *cheth*, " stillaro, fundero." Latin
gutta.

4. *Ma*, " but."

Armenian *na*, "but, however, rather, in fact, *rerum*."
Sanskrit *âm̃*, " *næ*." Tuschi *ma*, " but." Lapponic
ma, " quidem."

5. *Mi*, " I."

6. *Mathu*, " of wine."

Armenian *math*," syrup of grapes, *raisiné, defrutum*,"
which is declined like *get* (3). *Mathoy* would become
mathu in Etruscan.

German *meth:* English *mead:* Welsh *medd:* Greek

---

* I take this word to be the πεφανδγετα of Dioscorides, one of
the five names by which the Romans knew *artemisia* or *mugwort.*
Like Pliny's *elegia* (*ante*, p. 66), it might possibly have been bor-
rowed from Etruria.

μέθυ: Zend *mathu*, "wine": Sanskrit *madhu*, "honey,
wine, intoxicating drink"; *mad*, "to be intoxicated";
mada, "intoxication, madness": Persian *may*, *mul*,
"wine": Lydian μῶλαξ, "εἶδος οἴνου." Armenian
moli, "mad, intoxicated"; *metr*, "honey," gen. *metov*:
Greek μῶλυ.

7. *Mar*, "a pot" or "measure" (German *mass*).

Armenian *mar*, "a measure of liquids"—"μετρητής,
firkin" (John ii. 6): Persian *mar*, "measure, number":
Greek μάρις, "a measure containing six κοτύλαι (about
three pints)":* Albanian *merö*, "every liquid and dry
measure": Lithuanian *mẽra*, "measure": Russian *mjera*,
"measure." Albanian *marr*, "to hold, to contain":
Georgian *marani*, "a wine-cellar," = Armenian *maran*,
Sanskrit, *mâ*, *mas*, "to measure." The Etruscan *mar*
and *mathu* seem to contain Aryan roots of universal
prevalence.

8. *Am*, "am."

Armenian ...*em*		
Persian ......*am*		
Behistun ......*amiya*		
Zend ....*ahmi*	}	"I am."
Albanian ......*yam*		
Greek ....εἰμί		
Sanskrit ......*asmi*		

9. *Lisiai*, "for the tongue."

Armenian ...*lezov*		
Lithuanian ...*lēžuvis*	}	"a tongue."
Hebrew ......*lašon*		

---

* Μάρις may be a Thracian word; and the Latin *dolium* appears
in like manner == Armenian *doyl*, "bucket."

Armenian ... $\begin{cases} \textit{lezovl} \\ \textit{lizovl} \\ \textit{lizel} \\ \textit{lizanel} \end{cases}$ $\left. \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \right\}$ " to *lick*."

Lithuanian ......*lėžu*
Persian ....*lisîdan* $\left. \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \right]$

Persian ....*lîs*
Sanskrit ....*lih* $\left. \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \right\}$ "*lick*" (root).

Observe the letter-change in the Sanskrit *lih* and the Etruscan *lis*-iai. The genitive and dative of the Armenian *lezov* (i. o. *lezu*) are *lezovi*. But the Etruscan *lisia*, " a tongue," would be declined more nearly like such borrowed Armenian proper names as *Angtia*, "England," gen. and dat. *Angtiay;* or *Anania*, "Ananias," gen. and dat. *Ananiay.*

10. *Thipurenai*, " for the thirsty" (tongue).

In *thip* we meet with a very common Aryan root for " heat." In Armenian this root is *tap* or *thaph*, which has been discerned before in the Etruscan *thapna* (*ante,* p. 94). The Armenian *tapeun,* " burning, heated," would give the meaning of *thipurenai,* but the termination must be explained from such Armenian words as those which follow :—

$\begin{cases} \textit{hayr,} \text{ " father."} \\ \textit{hayr-órén,} \text{ " paternally."} \end{cases}$

$\begin{cases} \textit{archay,} \text{ " king."} \\ \textit{archay-órén,} \text{ " royally."} \end{cases}$

$\begin{cases} \textit{ham-ak,} \text{ " entire, ontirely ": root } \textit{ham,} = \dot{o}\mu(\acute{o}\varsigma). \\ \textit{ham-órén,} \text{ " entire, entirely."} \\ \textit{ham-órini,} \text{ gen. and dat. of } \textit{ham-órén.} \end{cases}$

$\begin{cases} \textit{get,} \text{ " beauty."} \\ \textit{get-a-yórén,} \text{ " fair."} \end{cases}$

$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text{\textit{órén}, " a law, a rule."} \\ \text{\textit{órin-ak}, " example, type, form."} \\ \text{\textit{yórin-el}, " to form, to shape."} \\ \text{\textit{órin-akel}, " to form, to represent."*}\end{array}\right.$

Nearly similar terminations may be found in the Armenian words:—*Hay-erén*, "Armenian, Haïcan"— *phokh-arén*, "payment"— *kerp*, *kerp-aran*, "form, figure." There is no indication of genders in the Armenian language; but such proper names as *Athenas*, "Pallas," gen. and dat. *Athenay*, are declined like *thipurenai*, which would be a feminine adjective agreeing with *lisiai*.

11. *Ethe*, "if," or "when."†

$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text{Armenian ...\textit{ethé}} \\ \text{Zend ....\textit{yézi, yéidhi}} \\ \text{Behistun ......\textit{yadiya}} \\ \text{Sanskrit ......\textit{yadi}}\end{array}\right\}$ "if."

---

* Compare with *órin-aké*, "he forms," the Etruscan verbs, *len-ache*, *tur-ke* and *tur-uke*, *ers-ke*, *te-ke*, *silachn-ke* and *silachn-uke*. Such Armenian words as *hayr*, "father," and *mayr*, "mother," intimate that the Armenian language, in its earliest existent state, is not very ancient. Indeed, the oldest Armenian writings only date from about 400 A D. For the Armenian forms for " daughter," " brother," and " sister," see *ante*, pp. 63, 88, 93. The Phrygian inscriptions, as might be expected, bear evidence of much higher antiquity; for in them we find *materos* and *materan*, = μητέρος and μητέρα, = *matris* and *matrem*, = Sanskrit *mátaras* and *mátaram*. Compare *materan* and *mayr* with *matrem* and *mère*. The Armenians have a word *orstr*, "son," which possesses the Aryan termination of *pa-ter*, *ma-ter*, and *daugh-ter*, and seems peculiar to the Armenian language, where *ors* means " teach," and also " shoulder."

† That *ethe* here means " when" or " if," was inferred by Dr. Donaldson from its position, and without the guidance of any linguistic resemblances.—*Varronianus*, p. 167 (2nd edition). This gives force to those resemblances which I have adduced.

Behistun ......*yata, yathá* $\Big\}$ " when."
Sanskrit ......*yadâ*

12. *Erai,* "joyous," or " of joy."

Armenian *erah, khrakh, ovrakh,* " joyous, merry ": *ovrakh linel,* " εὐφραίνεσθαι" (Luke xv. 24) : *kér, árb, ev ovrakh ler,* "φάγε, πίε, (καὶ) εὐφραίνου" (Luke xii. 19).

Armenian *erakhan,* " a banquet." Cf. ἔρανος. *Erakhan* would probably = *erah khan,* "joyous table," as *khan* means "table" in Armenian.

13. *Sie,* " it bo."

Armenian *ižé,* " it be, it may be, may it be." A comparison with the terminations of a Sanskrit *parasmaipada* verb (*infra,* cap. v) tends to shew that the Armenian has preserved here the precative form of the substantive verb, and that the subjunctive would be *žié.*

Sanskrit *syât:* Latin *sit* (= *siet*): German *sei.* Italian *sia.*

14. *Epana,* " the feast," nominative to *sie.*

Armenian *eph, ephovmn,* "cooking." Hebrew *aphah,* "to cook." Latin *epulari.* Greek ὀπτάω, ἕψω, ὄψον. For the termination of *ep-ana,* compare the Armenian *kap,* "a bond," *kap-el,* " to contract," *kap-an,* "a strait" — *gël-el,* "to roll," *gël-an,* "a cylinder" — *chah-el,* " to expiate," *chah-anay,* " a priest." The Armenian prefers to terminate words with -*ay,* instead of -*a* simply. *Epana,* and also *kana* (*ante,* p. 83), are just like in form to the Sanskrit *dâna,* " gift."

15. *Mi,* " mo." See 1.
16. *Nethu,* " of liquor."

Armenian *nivth*, "substance, matter," *hetanivth*, "fluid substance, liquid," which are declined like *math* (6), and thus give in the genitive, dative, and ablative, *nivthoy* and *hetanivthoy*. *Nethuns* is the Etruscan form of *Neptunus*. As we have in Armenian *ivt* and *et*, "oil," and *givt* and *get*, "village," *nivth* would be very nearly *neth*, though the Armenian *iv* is usually pronounced like the German *ü*, and occasionally like the English *u* in *tune*. Compare the river-names *Neda* and *Nith*, and the Sanskrit *nadî*, "river."

17. *Nastav*, "the guest."

Armenian ...*nsdeh* ⎫
Persian ......*nâstâ*∗ ⎬ "stranger, foreigner."

Arabic ....*nazil*, "stranger, foreigner, visitor, guest." ·

Hebrew ......*nasa'*, "to migrate"; *nasa*, "to err." ·

∗ C. Calidius *Nasta*, "Strange, Guest," appears as a proper name in a Neapolitan inscription (Donati, p. 4), and *Nastes* is mentioned by Homer as one of the two Carian leaders. I have already noticed (*ante*, p. 85) that *Mestles* was an Etruscan proper name. It is a singular coincidence that the names, *Mestles* and *Nasta*, should be found in Italian inscriptions, one of them at Volterra, and that Homer, "Mæonii carminis ales," who would probably know what proper names were used in Lydia and Caria, should have written :—

Μήστων αὖ ΜΕΣΘΛΗΣ τε καὶ Ἄντιφος ἡγησάσθην.

and—

ΝΑΣΤΗΣ αὖ Καρῶν ἡγήσατο βαρβαροφώνων.

Lethe and *Lethi*, again, were Etruscan proper names (*ante*, p. 69); and Homer says that the Pelasgians at Troy were commanded by Hippothous and Pylæus,

υἷε δύω ΛΗΘΟΙΟ Πελασγοῦ Τευταμίδαο.

In Tuschi, *leth-* means "kämpfen, droben, schelten."

Sanskrit ......*neś*, "ire, se movere." *Nĕś-deh* would be one who goes from his country (*deh*).

18. *Helephu*, "empties."

Armenian . $\begin{cases} zet\check{o}vl, \text{ " to ponr "; } zet\check{k}h, \text{ " drunken."}* \\ het\check{o}vl, \text{ "to pour out, } \dot{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\chi\epsilon\hat{\imath}\nu\text{" (Rev. xvi. 2).} \\ het\check{o}v, \text{ " he pours out, he empties."} \end{cases}$

The root is *het*, " pouring, flowing," which is found just above in *het̓anivth* (16), where *nethu*, being qualified by *helephu*, acquires the meaning of *het̓anivth* instead of *nivth*. The formation of *helephu* from a root *hel* may be thus illustrated from the Armenian :—

$\begin{cases} sôs, \text{ " causing tremor" (root).} \\ sós\text{-}aph\text{-}il, \text{ " to tremble."} \\ thúth\text{-}aph\text{-}el, \text{ " to shake" (active).} \end{cases}$
$ded\text{-}ev\text{-}el, \text{ " to reel."}$
$\begin{cases} khovs\text{-}el, \text{ " to fly."} \\ khovs\text{-}aph\text{-}el, \text{ " to fly."} \end{cases}$
$\begin{cases} sarź \\ sarsaph \end{cases} \text{ " a trembling."}$
$\begin{cases} sarźil \\ sarsil \\ sarsaphil \end{cases} \text{ " to tremble."}$

Similar forms are presented by *sôśaphel*, "to touch," *kachavel*, " to dance," and *sovthaphel*, " to hasten": so that *het̓aphov*, as well as *het̓ov*, " ho empties," might exist in an Armenian dialect.

Helephu is the last word in the Inscription of Cervetri. If all the Armenian words cited to explain this in-

---

* Cf. Thracian ζεῖλα, " οἶνος."—Bötticher's *Arica*, p. 50.

scription bo now collected together, and written in Etruscan letters, we should ohtain in grammatical syntax, though the idiom might not be perfectly correct, the following Armenian couplot :—

> *es mi ketu na es mathu mar em lezui tapean :*
> *ethe erah ize ephumn, zis nithu nesteh helu.*

Or, adopting snch modifications as aro warranted by the Armenian language itsolf—

> *me mi ketu na me mathu mar em lezui tapurini :*
> *ethe erah zie ephanay, me nithu nesteh helaphu.*

This distich differs but slightly from the Inscription of Cervetri, and almost entirely preserves the metre in which it is composed. Nor can it bo said that the sense which the Armenian supplies for the Etruscan is at all forced or inappropriate; hnt, on the contrary, that it expresses exceedingly well what so festivo a nation might have inscribed on one of their drinking-cups. For tho meaning of tho two verses wonld be:—

1.		2.	
mi	I	*ethe*	if
ni	not	*erai*	joyons
kethu	of water	*sie*	be
ma	but	*epana,*	the feast,
mi	I	*mi*	me
mathu	of wino	*nethu*	of liqnor
mar	a cup	*nastav*	the guest
am	am	*helephu.*	empties.
lisiai	for the tongue		
thipurenai:	thirsty :		

The sentiment of the second verso brings to mind

Goethe's line on the drinking-cup of the King of Thule:
Er leert' ihn jeden Schmaus. Some unimportant modi-
fications might be suggested in the interpretation of
the inscription. Thus *lisiai thipurenai* might be made
a locative, "on (his) thirsty tongue," and connected
with the second verse instead of the first. If, again,
remembering that the Etruscan is several centuries
older than the earliest existing Armenian, we compare
the Etruscan *kethu, mathu,* and *nethu,* with the Sans-
krit *madhu,* the Zend *mathu,* the Greek μέθυ, the
Phrygian βέδυ, "water," and the Macedonian βέθυ,
"nir" (both these last words being = Armenian *vivth,*
"water, moisture, element, matter"), such analogies
would lead us to consider the Etruscan words as nomi-
natives or accusatives, rather than as genitives or
ablatives. If they be in the accusative, then we should
probably read, with Lepsius and Donaldson, *maram*
instead of *maram;* and have to regard *maram* as a
transitive verb of the second Armenian conjugation,
like *tam,* "I give," or *ertham,* "I go," and signifying
"I contain," or "I dispense." Compare the Albanian
marr, "I contain," and the German *fass* and *fassen.*
This alteration would have the advantage of obviating
one little objection: for, if the Etruscan *sie* signify "it
be," "I am" should rather be *em* than *am.* We have,
however, both *am* and *is, wast* and *wert,* in English,
where there is a similar change of vowel. If *nethu* be
a nominative or accusative, *mi nethu* would be ren-
dered "my liquor," or "my contents," *mi* being
equivalent to "my" or "of me," both rendered in

Armenian by *im*. Finally, if *mi nethu* be a nominative, *helephu* would have a passive or neuter signification— the Armenian *zetov* is both active and neuter, like "pours" in English—and *nastav* would be in the instrumental case, and = Armenian *nsdehiv*. The instrumental cases of *nav*, "a ship," and *kin*, "a woman," namely *navav* and *knav*, come still nearer in form to *nastav*.

With these modifications the interpretation of the inscription would be: "I do not contain water, but wine: when there is a joyous feast, my liquor is poured out by the guest on (his) thirsty tongue." Perhaps this is on the whole the preferable interpretation of the two.

It does not require the knowledge of many sentences, nor of a large number of words and inflexions, to enable us to pronounce upon the character of any language; so that the properties of the Etruscan have probably been sufficiently displayed in the specimens already given and analysed, which seem to include all the forms whose meaning is tolerably clear. The result is that, instead of there being no language which can claim kindred with the Etruscan, there are, on the contrary, two in Asia which may succeed in establishing a near relationship to it by explaining it to a considerable extent. The Armenian appears to do this in a very close manner, especially when it is considered that Armenia and Etruria are at opposite extremities of a long and

not entirely unbroken chain of old Thracian coun-
tries, like Wallachia and Portugal among those of
Latin speech. It may even be said, perhaps, that
the Armenian resembles the distant Etruscan more
than it does the neighbouring Phrygian, with which
it was connected by the ancients. But even if the
Armenian had perished with the rest of the Thra-
cian languages, of which only a few relics survive,
yet the affinities between the Sanskrit and the Etrus-
can would still have afforded some clue to indicate
who the Etruscans were. Their language would be
nearly allied to the Sanskrit, but would neverthe-
less belong to a different Aryan family, as the letter-
changes would imply. No doubt the Sanskrit has
some few advantages over the Armenian in the com-
parison of languages. Thus the Etruscan *semph-*,
"seven," is nearer to the Sanskrit *saptan* than it is to
the Zend *haptan*, the Persian *haft*, or the Armenian
evthn; and the Etruscan *sas*, "six," is nearer to the
Sanskrit *śaś* than it is to the Armenian *weš*. But
the Latin *septem* and *sex* are likewise nearer to the
Sanskrit *saptan* and *śaś* than they are to the Greek
ἑπτά and ἕξ; and yet the Latin and Greek are con-
sidered to belong to the same Aryan family of lan-
guages, while the Sanskrit and Latin are not so classed
together. There are letter-changes which distinguish
one Aryan family from another, as there are letter-
changes which distinguish different members of the
same family from one another. There is, besides, no
letter-change in the case of the Armenian *weš* and the

Etruscan *sas*, as both wonld be ultimately derived, along with tho Albanian *gyaś(tĕ)* and the Persian *śaś*, from a form like the Zond *khsvas*, by tho omission of different letters, after the manner in which the Old Norse *fimm* and tho Anglo-Saxon *fîf* are deduced from the Gothic form, *fimf.* The argument from similarity or dissimilarity of numerals must not be pressed too far. Thus the Swedish *tio* and the German *zehn* have not ono letter in common. The Gothic *fidvôr*, too, resembles tho Welsh *pedwar* more than the German *vier :* yet the Gothic was a Teutonic, not a Celtic dialect. The right conclusion would be, that the Gothic and Welsh forms are older than tho German, as the Zend *thri* and tho Etruscan *thr-* are older than the Armenian *ere*, " three." So, again, the Welsh *pump* and tho Breton *pemp* are more like to the Gothic *fimf* than they are to tho Gaelic *cuig*, as the Welsh *pedwar* and the Breton *pevar* are more like to the Gothic *fidvôr* and the Anglo-Saxon *fcover* than they are to tho Gaelic *ceathair.** Nor is the advantage all on the sido of the Sanskrit in respect of the Etruscan numerals. *Mach* (with *me-* and *muv-*), " ono," is Armenian, but not Sanskrit; and tho Armenian *hing*, " fivo," leads us from tho Sanskrit *pańćan* to tho Etruscan *kiem* or *chiem*.

It might be conjectured, on accouut of proximity,

---

* To get from *pemp* to *cuig*, we should pass through the Greek πέμπε and πέντε, the Lithuanian *penki*, the Armenian *hing*, and the Latin *quinque*. Greek and Oscan resemble Welsh, as Latin resembles Gaelic.

that the Etruscans were Illyrians rathor than Thracians,
if the Illyrians bo supposed to coustitute a distinct
Aryan family. But, even if we set aside other argu-
ments, and lay moro stress than is allowable on numerals,
there would yet bo no necessity for such a conclnsion,
as the Albanian nnmerals hardly come nearer the
Etruscan than tho Armenian numerals do. Thoso are
the Albanian numerals from I to X: *nyë, dú, trê, katër,
pesë,** gyaś(të), śta(të), te(të), nën(dë), dhye(të).* The
correspondiug Armenian numerals are: *ez* (and also
mi, mov, and *mén), erkov* (not Aryan), *er* or *ere(ch),
éor(ch)* or *char, hing, weẕ* (in composition *weś* and
wath), evthn, ovth, inn (= *inën), tasn.*

Such advantages as the Sanskrit may havo over the
Armenian in some few instances cannot counterbalauco
tho weight of evidonco on the other side, so as to take
the Etruscans out of the Thracian family. It is not to
be expected that every Thracian language should bo
quite like tho Armenian, any more than that every
Tcutonic langnage should bo quito like the English, or
that every Celtic language should be quito like the
Welsh, or every Neo-Latin language quite like the
French. And, whilo the Sanskrit explains so mnch of
the Etruscan, it almost, by that very fact, disposes of
its own claims to iuclude the Etruscans iu the Indian
family. Such a word as *suthina,* for instance, if ex-
plained by the Sanskrit *hu,* "Diis offerre"—and a
word found singly on votive offerings is perfectly so

---

* Compare the Lettish *peezi,* which belongs to the same family
as the Lithuanian *penki.*

explained—is nearly decisive by itself. *Suthina* would not be a Sanskrit word; while, on the other hand, the Armenian brings out *suthina* from *hu* by presenting both the right letter-change, as well as the termination, in the word *zohorthivn,* "sacrifice." It enables us also to form such Etruscan words as *zilachnke* and thip*urenai* from Aryan roots, where other Aryan languages would not qualify us to construct them; and it has, in addition, the Etruscan *l* terminations, besides the singular Etruscan peculiarity of retaining in poetry the vowel which is discarded in prose. The Slavonian family of languages might compete with the Armenian on the ground of the letter-changes, but would fall far behind it, as well as behind the Sanskrit, in explaining Etruscan words. There is likewise a geographical improbability against the Sanskrit by reason of distance, and because Armenia fills up the gap between the Caucasian and Semitic nations.

The evidence in favour of the Armenian affinities of the Etruscan is not exhausted by the Etruscan inscriptions. For we find in Etruria place-names resembling the Armenian *sén* and *lori,* which may be described as the *town* and *home,* or *-ton* and *-ham,* of Armenia; as we find among Dacian plant-names terms like the Armenian *khot* and *det,* which are the *kraut* and *wurz* of Armenia. Finally, the Etruscan and Rhætian were said on sufficient authority to be cognate languages, and in Rhætia there are still apparent relics of an Armenian dialect; while in the Pyrenean *sern-eille,* "glacier," a similar dialect seems to have

penetrated still farther west than Etruria. It can hardly be accidental that the only Thracian language still existing should emerge wherever the ancients have placed a Thracian people.*

---

* The quarter in which to look for the right language to explain the Etruscan was indicated by Bonarruoti a century and a half ago: "Hortari postremo fas mihi sit, doctos præcipue *linguis Orientalibus* viros, ut animi viros intendant, ad illustrandam veterem Etruscam linguam, tot jam seculis deperditam. Et quis vetat sperare, quod temporum decursu emergat aliquis, qui difficilem et inaccessam viam aperiat, et penetralia linguæ hujus reseret?" Niebuhr was less sanguine in his expectations. "People," he says, "feel an extraordinary curiosity to discover the Etruscan language ; and who would not entertain this sentiment ? I would give a considerable part of my worldly means as a prize, if it were discovered ; for an entirely new light would then be spread over the ethnography of ancient Italy. But, however desirable it may be, it does not follow that the thing is attainable." And yet it has been known from the first that the ages of deceased persons were denoted in Etruscan by such forms as *avil ril* LXV, *ril leine* LV, and *lupu avils* XVII, which might, it would seem, have opened the way to the discovery, as they supply us with four words whose meaning can hardly be said to be doubtful, and which are thoroughly explained in every respect by the Armenian and Sanskrit languages.

CHAPTER V.

CONJUGATIONS AND NUMERALS.

It may be considered unnecessary to prove the Aryan
character of the Armenian language by an analysis of
the Armenian verb; so that the evidence in demon-
stration of the Etruscan being an Aryan language of
the Armenian or Thracian type might have been closed
with the interpretation of the Inscription of Cervetri.
But the Armenians are even yet not universally ad-
mitted into the Aryan family, although it is difficult to
perceive on what grounds their right to such ad-
mission has been disputed; as their vocabulary, and,
what is of more importance, their grammar also, are
both decidedly Aryan. That their vocabulary is so in
substance, the previous chapters may have sufficiently
shewn; and in the present chapter I shall endeavour,
by an examination of Armenian conjugations, to com-
plete the proof that their grammar is so too. Albanian
and Rhæto-Romance conjugations will likewise be
found compared with similar forms in other Aryan
languages: and from these I have passed to Caucasian
and Basque conjugations, in order to exemplify a
little how far these languages deviate from the Aryan,
and approach or differ from one another. Lastly, as

the primeval population of Europe and Asia Minor
may be conjectured (*ante*, p. 12) to have been com-
posed of Caucasian, Basque, and Finnish elements, I
have attempted to gain some insight into the obscure
question of the relationship among these three races
by an examination of their numerals.   There are some
indications of primeval affinity here which I have not
found noticed, and which may appropriately bring
this present inquiry to a termination.

ARYAN CONJUGATIONS.
Present Indicative.

Lithuanian.	Sanskrit.	Rhæto-Romance.
esmi	*asmi*	*sunt*
essi	*asi*	*cis*
esti	*asti*	*ei*
esma	*smas*	*essen*
este	*stha*	*esses*
esti	*santi*	*ean*

Albanian.	Zend.	Behistun.	Armenian.
yam	*ahmi*	*amiya*	*em*
yê	*ahi*	.	*es*
ëstë	*asti*	*astiya*	*é*
yemi	*hmahi*	*amahya*	*emch**
yini	*stha*		*ech*
yänë	*henti*		*en*

---

* Here the Sanskrit *-mas* is converted into the Zend and Behis-
tun *-mah-*, and the Armenian *-mch*, as we found (*ante*, p. 44) the
Sanskrit *más*, "moon," converted into the Behistun *máh-*, the Ar-
menian *mah-*, and the Etruscan *mach*.

French.	Latin.	Italian.
suis	*sum*	*sono*
es	*es*	*sei*
est	*est*	*è*
sommes	*sumus*	*siamo*
êtes	*estis*	*siete*
sont	*sunt*	*sono**

Imperfect Indicative.

Sanskrit (1st aorist).	Sanskrit.	Albanian.	Armenian (1st aorist).
adik-śam	*ásam*	*yeśē*	*sir-ezï*
-*śas*	*ásîs*	*yeśe*	-*ezer*
-*śat*	*ásît*	*iś*	-*eaẍ*
-*śámu*	*ásma*	*yeśëm*	-*eẍach†*
-*śata*	*ásta*	*yeśëtē*	-*eẍich*
-*śan*	*ásan*	*iśnē*	-*eẍin*

Zend.	Behistun.	Armenian.
		ëi
		ëir
ás	*áha*	*ér*
		éach
		éich
	áha	*éin*

---

* Dante on two occasions uses *en* and *enno* for *sono*; forms which are like the Armenian *en* and the Rhæto-Romance *ean*.

† Here the Armenian omits the *m* of the Sanskrit and Albanian, but retains, under the form of *ch*, the final *s* which they drop. So, in the 2nd pers. plur., *t* is dropped, but *s* retained, in Armenian.

Sanskrit.	Zend.	Behistun.
abhavam	*baóm*	*abavam*
abhavas	*bavô*	
abhavat	*bavaṭ*	*abava*
abhavâma	*bavâma*	
abhavata	*bavata*	
abhavan	....	*abava*

Rhæto-Romance.	Albanian (aorist).
fova	*kërko-va**
fovas	*-va*
fova	*-i*
fovan	*-uam*
fovas	*-uatë*
fovan	*-uanë*

The root *bhu* or *fu* is not fonnd in the Armenian language, which employs *li* or *et* instead. This may account for there being no such words as *fuius* or *puia* in Armenian (*ante*, p. 60). In the Armenian first aorist, as in *sir-ezi*, "I loved," the *s* of the Sanskrit root *as* appears as *z*, as it does also in the Armenian snbjunctive. *Scrip-si*, (ἐ)φίλ-ησα (= ἐφιλέ-εσα), and *sir-ezi*, are analogous forms, all bearing a similar relation to the imperfect or preterite of the substantive verb that the corresponding form in Sanskrit does: and *-ezi* is to *éi* what *-εσα* is to *ἦν*, as may be readily seen when the Greek and Armenian forms are thus placed together :—

* *Kërkova*, " I sought," = Italian *cercava*, "I was seeking."

	Greek.			Armenian.	
1st aorist terminations.		Impft.	1st aorist terminations.		Impft.
-εσα	-σα	ἦν	-eżi		éi
-εσας	-σας	ἦς	-eżer		éir
-εσε	-σε	ἦ	-eaż		ér
-εσαμεν	-σαμεν	ἦμεν	-eżach		éach
-εσατε	-σατε	ἦτε	-eżich		éich
-εσαν	-σαν	ἦσαν	-eżin		éin

In the imperfect of the substantive verb, both languages assume the augment (which lengthens the initial *e*), but drop, with one exception in each case, the sibilant of the root, which the Greek retains in the 3rd pers. plur., and the Armenian, under the form of *r*, in the 3rd pers. sing. The 2nd aorist, as well as the 1st, is formed from the imperfect or preterite of the substantive verb; and the manner in which it is done is again similar in Sanskrit, Greek, and Armenian; as may be exemplified by the 2nd aorist of "to place" in those three languages, to which a second form of the Albanian aorist is added :—

	2nd Aorist.		
Sanskrit.	Greek.	Armenian.	Albanian.
a-dh-âm	ἔ-θ-ην	e-d-i	plyak-a
a-dh-âs	ἔ-θ-ης	e-d-er	plyak-e
a-dh-ât	ἔ-θ-η	e-d	plyak-i
a-dh-âma	ἔ-θ-εμεν	e-d-ach	plyak-m
a-dh-âta	ἔ-θ-ετε	e-d-ich	plyak-të
a-dh-us	ἔ-θ-εσαν	e-d-in*	plyak-në

---

* Though there are two forms of the aorist in Armenian, yet no verb has more than one of them, except in the participle.

Sir-éi, "amabam," *sir-eži*, "amavi," and *e-d-i*, "posui," exhibit the three preterite forms of the Armenian.

Present Subjunctive, Potential, & Precative or Optative.

Sansk. (snbj.)*	Rhæto-Rom. (subj., pot. prec.)
syam	*seig*
syas	*seias*
syat	*seig*
syáma	*seian*
syata	*scias*
syan	*seian*

Sansk. (pot.)	Alb. (subj., pot., prec.)
yâm	*yém*
yâs	*yéš*
yât	*yét*
yáma	*yémi*
yáta	*yini*
yus	*yénë*

Sansk. (prec.)	Arm. (subj., pot., prec.)
yâsam	*ižem*
yás	*ižes*
yát	*ižé*
yâsma	*ižemch*
yásta	*ižéch*
yâsus	*ižen*

If we omit the *ž* in these Armenian forms, we get the Sanskrit and Albanian potential; and if we trans-

---

* This and the two following forms are taken from a *parasmai-pada* verb.

pose the *i* and *z̈*, the Sanskrit and Latin subjunctive,
for *sim = siem*. The Armenian equivalent to the Latin
sit would thus be *z̈ié*, = Etruscan *sie* (*ante*, p. 103).

The only Armenian future is a *futurum exactum*,
like *scripsero* and *τυφθήσομαι*, being formed from the
aorist by the addition of terminations which are modi-
fications of the different persons of the subjunctive of
the substantive verb; as *sirez̈-iz̈*, "amabo" (amavero),
from *sirez̈-i*, "amavi." One of the following examples
will exhibit a *first* aorist future of the *e* conjugation,
and the other a *second* aorist future of the *i* conjuga-
tion: an Albanian aorist subjunctive is added, as being
a form almost identical with the *futurum exactum* :—

<div align="center">

Subjunctive.

sir-*iz̈em**	lin-*iz̈im*
sir-*iz̈es*	lin-*iz̈is*
sir-*iz̈é*	lin-*iz̈i*
sir-*iz̈emch*	lin-*iz̈imch*
sir-*iz̈éch*	lin-*iz̈ich*
sir-*iz̈en*	lin-*iz̈in*

Future.

sirez̈-*iz̈*	l†-*iz̈im*
sires-*z̈es*	l-*iz̈is*
sires-*z̈é*	l-*iz̈i*
sires-*z̈ovch*	l-*iz̈ovch*‡
sires-*ǵich*	l-*iz̈ich*, or -*iǵich*
sires-*z̈en*	l-*iz̈in*

</div>

---

* The subjunctive of the substantive verb is accurately pre-
served here throughout all the persons.

† The Armenian, like the Sanskrit and Greek, drops the con-
jugational *n* in the aorist and future.

‡ Cf. Armenian anovn = nomen.

Albanian Aorist Snhjunctive.

plyak-*śa* or plyak-*tśa*

plyak-*ś* or plyak-*tś*

plyak-*të*

plyak-*śim* or plyak-*tśim*

plyak-*śi* or plyak-*tśi*

plyak-*śinë* or plyak-*tśinë*.

The Albanian *tś*, in the second of these forms, shews a tendoncy to convert tho Sanskrit *s* into a sound resembling the Armonian *ż* (*tz*) or *ǵ* (*dś*). In the Armenian *sireżes*, etc., the *ż* of *sireżi* becomes *s*. Tho Armenian and Albanian forms are both analogous in their terminations to thc Sanskrit 2nd fnture :—

Sanskrit.

Subj. of "to be."	Subj. terminations.	2nd Fut. terminations.
syâm	*-syam*	*-syámi*
syâs	*-syas*	*-syasi*
syât	*-syat*	*-syati*
syâma	*-syáma*	*-syámas*
syâta	*-syata*	*-syatha*
syus	*-syan*	*-syanti*

The Armenian perfect is fermed by combining the proterite participlo with tho present indicative of tho substantive verb. For the participle compare :—

Armenian { *sir-eal*, " loved," or " having loved."
          { *pah-eal*, " kopt," or " having kept."

Old Slavonic *by-t'*, " having been."

Mahratti *pâh-ilâ*, " seen" (cf. Dacian φιθοφθεθ-ελά; *ante*, p. 9).

And, for the perfect, compare :—

Armenian *sireal em*, " I have loved" (root *sir*).

Bengâli *kŏrilâm*, " I made" (root *kŏr*).*

Bohemian *byl sem* }
Polish *bytem*   } " I was" (root *by*).

An Armenian pluperfect, like *sireal êi*, "I had loved," i. e. "I was having loved," calls for no observation ; and the same may be said of the imperative :—

Sanskrit.	Latin.	Armenian.
edhi	*es*	*er*
sta	*este* ·	*éch* or *erouch*.

CAUCASIAN AND BASQUE CONJUGATIONS.

Basquo verbs aro usually conjugated by combining a few auxiliary verbs and pronouns, united together in various agglutinate .or incorporated forms, with the present participle, tbe preterite participle, and the future participle, of a particular verb. Tbese participles are sometimes called infinitives. The Armenian *sireal em* and the French *aimer-ai* are modes of conjugation like those in Basque. Thoagh Basque verbs have a strange appearance on acconat of the extent to wbich agglutination or incorporation is carried, yet tbey are simple enough when analysed. Thus *ecarri nézaque*, "je pouvais apporter," is quite plain when resolved into *ecarri n-éza-que*, "to-carry I-was-able"; *n-* being = *ni*, " I," *eza* the substantive verb, and *que* = Latin *que-o*. *Nézaque* is only "potoram" with the ·order of

---

* These analogies are derived from Bopp (*V. G.*, p. 1159). His argument, that *kŏrilâm* "von participialem Ursprung zu sein scheint," would be strengthened by the Armenian *sireal em*, which is not agglutinate like *kŏrilâm*.

the three elements reversed, as in tho English "I was able." So again, *ecarri guinitzaiztzuque*, "nous to les pouvions apporter," is *ecarri guín-itz-aiz-tzu-que*, "to-carry we-them-were-to yon-able."

As personal pronouns present some of tbe most intimato signs of affinity between different langnages, I shall endcavour to detach from these agglutinato forms tbo personal pronouns, or pronominal affixes, which are tbe subjects of tbe auxiliary verbs. It will be fonnd that there is moro than one such affix for each person, and that tho Basqne pronouns, in their present state, cannot explain several of tho affixes. In tbe forms which I shall cite, all but tbe subjectivo affixes will bo enclosed in brackets, so as to leave nothing but what belongs to tho pronouns implicitly found in the Basque language; and I shall begin by placing tbe Basque *naiz*, "I am," between tbe Georgian *var*, "I am," and *machûs*, "I bave." In both languages, as will bo seen, the root of "being" has a common origin witb tho Aryan root; and this root takes three forms in Basque, as it does in tbe English *am*, *art*, *is*, *ar(e)*.

Georgian.	Basqne.	Georgian.
v(ar)	*n(aiz)*	*m(achûs)*
kh(ar)	*(aiz)*, *c(era)*	*g(achûs)*
(ar)s	*d(a)*	*(achûs, achûn)*
v(ar)th	*gu(era)*	*gv(achûs)*
kh(ar)th	*c(era)te*	*g(achûs)th*
(ar)ian	*d(ira)*	*h(chon)ian*

There is a very clear resemblance bere between

the Basque and the Georgian in the 2nd pers. sing. and in the 1st and 2nd pers. plur. Four other Basque conjugations are:—

n(uen)	*n(uque)*
(uen), *cend(uen)*	*cend(uque)*
z(uen), *ce(uen)*	*l(uque)*
guen(uen), *guend(uen)**	*guend(uque)*
cen(u)t(en), *cend(u)t(en)*	*cend(uque)te*
z(u)t(en), *cen(uen)*	*l(uque)te*
n(ezan)	*n(ioteque)*
cen(ezan)	*cen(ioteque)*
c(ezan)	*l(ioteque)*
guen(ezan)	*guin(ioteque)*
cen(eza)te(n)	*cin(ioteque)*
c(eza)te(n)	*l(ioteque)*

Z-t(e), *l-te*, *cend-te*, and *cen-te* mark the plural of the persons *z* and *l*, "he," and *cend* and *cen*, "thou," just as we previously found in Basque, *c(era)*, "thou art," and *c(era)te*, "ye are"; and in Georgian, *v(ar)*, "I am," and *v(ar)th*, "we are"; *kh(ar)*, "thou art," and *kh(ar)th*, "ye are."† In the Basque verbs cited above, the pronominal affixes were *pre*fixed: in the verb which follows, they are *post*fixed :—

---

* The *d* in *guend-* and *cend-* seems not radical, but phonetic or euphonic. The sound of *d* rises between *n* and *u*, like that of *p* between *m* and *s*, as in *Sampson*.

† Compare Ossetic forms like *lag*, "man," *lagthä*, "men"; *ye*, "he," *yethä*, "they." The Ossetic plural suffix is *-thä* or *-the* (Sjögren, p. 52).

$(de)t$
$(de)c, (de)n, de(zu)$
$(de)u$
$(de)gu$
$(de)zue, (de)zute$
$(de)ue, (d)ute$

These pronominal affixes, with the addition of the actual Basque pronouns, will give us the pronominal forms contained in Basque for " I, thou, he, we, ye, they." But, before they are compared with Caucasian and other forms, it is advisable to mention the complete Georgian form for "I." The pronoun itself is *me*, but the genitive *čemi*, as well as the other cases of the pronoun, shew that *čem* is another or a more perfect form, just as *šen*, "thou," makes *šeni*, "of thee." The Aryan analogies to the Basque will suggest themselves without notice. The Basque pronominal forms are :—

"I." $\begin{cases} ni \\ n- \end{cases}$ Hungarian *én*; Suanian *noi*, "we, *nos*";
$\quad\quad$ Lesgi *niše*, " we."
$\quad$ -*t*. Tuschi *so*, -*s*.
$\quad$ *Ten* or *teni* may be the complete Basque form.
$\quad$ Lesgi *den*, *tun*;* Georgian *čem(i)*; Lazic
$\quad\quad$ *škim(i)*.

"Thou." $\begin{cases} hi. \text{ Tuschi } ho, -h. \\ zu, -zu. \text{ Suanian } si. \quad \text{Greek } \sigma\acute{v}. \\ c-, -c. \text{ Georgian } hh-, g-. \\ -n \quad\quad\} \text{ Georgian } šen; \text{ Turkish } sen; \\ cen-, cin- \} \quad \text{Lazic } škan(i). \\ \text{The complete Basque form might be} \\ zchuen. \end{cases}$

---

* There are several Lesgi dialects. My authority for them is Klaproth's *Kaukasische Sprachen*.

"He, this, that."
$\left\{\begin{array}{l} a,\ au,\ o\ \} \text{ Tuschi } o;\text{ Turkish } o;\text{ Ab-} \\ \text{-}u\ \ \ \ \} \text{ khasian } ui. \\ ce\text{-},\ c\text{-}.\ \ \text{Georgian } igi;\text{ Lesgi } hegen, \\ \quad \text{gen. } hegei. \\ z\text{-}.\ \ \ \text{Turkish } \acute{s}u. \\ l\text{-}.\ \ \ \text{Turkish } ol;\text{ Lesgi } il;\text{ Snanian} \\ \quad alle. \\ d\text{-}.\ \ \text{Esthonian } ta;\text{ Lapponic } ta(t). \\ \quad \text{There would be more than a single} \\ \quad \text{form here.} \end{array}\right.$

"We."
$\left\{\begin{array}{l} gu,\ gu\text{-},\ \text{-}gu.\ \ \text{Georgian } gv\text{-};\text{ Tuschi } wai,\ thcho; \\ \quad \text{Lazic } \acute{s}ku. \\ guen\text{-},\ guin\text{-}.\ \ \text{Georgian } \acute{c}ven;\text{ Lazic } \acute{s}kun(i). \\ Guen \text{ seems plainly the complete Basque} \\ \quad \text{form.} \end{array}\right.$

"Ye."
$\left\{\begin{array}{l} zue(c),\ \text{-}zue,\ \text{-}zute.\ \ \text{Tuschi } \acute{s}u,\ \text{-}\acute{s}. \\ c\text{---}te.\ \ \text{Georgian } kh\text{---}th,\ g\text{---}th. \\ cin\text{-},\ cen\text{-},\ cen\text{---}te.\ \ \text{Georgian } thchven,\text{ Lazic} \\ \quad tqua,\ tquan(i). \\ \text{The complete Basque form seems nearly} \\ \quad zcuen. \end{array}\right.$

"They."
$\left\{\begin{array}{l} aic(c),\ oie(c),\ \text{-}ue.\ \ \text{Lesgi } hai,\ hoi,\ ua, \\ \quad \text{``this.''} \\ \left.\begin{array}{l} \text{-}ute \\ z\text{---}t \\ c\text{---}te \end{array}\right\}\ \text{See under ``ho.''} \\ \left.\begin{array}{l} l\text{---}te \\ l\text{-} \end{array}\right\}\ \text{Turkish } \text{-}l(er);\text{ Lesgi } il,\text{ ``ho.''} \\ d\text{-}.\ \ \text{Lapponic } tah;\text{ Lesgi } ti. \\ con\text{-}.\ \ \text{Georgian } igini;\text{ Lazic } hini. \end{array}\right.$

Assuming ten, zchuen, guen, and zcuen, as the complete or primitive Basque forms for "I," "thou," "we," and "ye," some suggestive comparisons may be made between the Aryan, Caucasian, and Basque languages:—

Greek ......*ἐγών*
Sanskrit...*aham*
Zend ......*azem*
Behistnn...*adam*
Lesgi ......*den*
Basque ...*ten*
Georgian . *ćem*
Lazic ... ..*śkim*
} "I," = *ah(am)*.

Zend ......*túm*
Behistun...*t'huwam*
Sanskrit ...*tvam*
Basque ...*zchuen*
Lazic ......*skan*
Georgian...*śen*
} "Thou," = *tv(am)*.

Tuschi......*wai*
Behistun...*wayam*
Sanskrit ...*vayam*
Zond ......*vaém*
Basque ..*guen*
Goorgian...*ćven*
Lazic ... $\begin{cases} śkun \\ śku \end{cases}$
Tuschi......*thcho*
} "We," = *vay(am)*.

Sanskrit ...*yúyam*
Zond ......*yúżem*
Basquo ...*zcucn*
Georgian...*thchven*
Lazic . $\begin{cases} tquan \\ tqua \end{cases}$
Welsh ......*chwi*
Tuschi......*śu*
} "Ye," = *yúy (am)*.

Although the Caucasian and Basque languagos are far from being Aryan, yet it seoms as if there were some ancient connexion between the three forms of speech. There may have been some group of men in Western Asia, from which the Basques first broko

off, and then the Caucasians; while the remainder, or
at least a part of the remainder, subsequently moulded
their language into the primitive Aryan, which be-
came subject to different modifications when the Aryan
race spread abroad, and became divided into families,
and subdivided into nations. For it is with the most
ancient Aryan forms that the Georgian and Basque
languages appear connected by their pronouns. The
Georgian *th-chve-n* and the early Basque *z-cue-n*, "ye,"
must be older than the Welsh *chwi*, "ye," if allied to
it; and the Georgian *č-ven* and the Basque *g-uen* seem
even more ancient than the Sanskrit *vayam*, "we,"
though the Tuschi *wai* would be a younger form. If
the resemblances in the cases of "we" and "ye"
justify us in identifying the Georgian and Basque ter-
mination -*en* with the Sanskrit termination -*am*, then
we should have a right to apply the same principle to
"I" and "thou." Here then the Caucasian and Basque
would retain signs of a characteristic which is only
found in the most ancient Aryan languages: "Den
ausgang -*am* in *aham tvam, azem túm*, entbehren alle
jüngeren sprachen" (Grimm). Yet we find in Cauca-
sian dialects *den, čem(i)*, and *škim(i)*,—*šen* and *skan(i)*,
for the singular of the first two personal pronouns,
and can construct from the Basque, *ten*, "I," and
zehuen, "thou."

One more resemblance between the Caucasian and
the Basque is worth notice. It may be seen from such
forms as *jangó nu-que*, "que je mangerais," when
compared with *ecarri néza-que*, "je pouvais apporter,"

that tho Basque conditional or potential is formed by
tho suffix *que*, implying " ability." The subjunctive
is formed in a similar manner by tbe suffix *lá*. Thus
we have :—

" venio," *natór*	*natorrelá*, " veniam."	
" venis," *atór*	*atorrelá*, " venias."	
" venit," *datór*	*dutorrelá*, " veniat."	
" venimus," *gatóz*	*gatorrelá*, " veniamus."	
" venitis," *zatózte*	*zatocelá*, " veniatis."	
" veniunt," *datóz*	*datoztelá*, " veniant."	

The subjunctivo is formed exactly in the same way
in Tuschi by the suffix *le*, which is referred by Schief-
ner to tbe verb *la(ar)*, " to wish." Cf. λά-ω. In
Tuschi, *do* is " facit," and *dole* is " faciat," like as in
Basque *dator* is " venit," and *datorrelá* is " veniat."
Tho conditional in Tuschi is formed by tho suffix *he*
or *h* : as *dahe* from *du*, " ho is," and *doh* from *do*, " he
does." In Lesgi we have *bugo*, " er ist," and *bugabi*,
" es sei."

NUMERALS.

It has been said by Grimm, in the chapter of his
Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache which is devoted to
the subject of original affinity (*urverwandschaft*): "Mit
recht hat man drei kennzeichen ermittelt, welche in
sämtlichen urverwandten sprachen, wo nicht nnverän-
dert, doch höchst deutlich und eigenthümlich an-
zutreffen sind, und füglich als symbol derselben auf-
gestellt werden dürfen. Ich meine dio übereinkunft
der *zahlen, persönlichen pronomina,* und einzelner

K

formen des *substantiven verbums*." Conjugations and
personal pronouns I have already examined as evi-
dences of early affinity; and now, by the aid of such a
comparison and analysis of numerals as I am able to.
make, I shall endeavour to penetrate a little further,
if possible, into the difficult subject of the original re-
lationship of the Basques, the Fins, and the Caucasians,
the three races by whom Europe was probably peopled
at the time when the Aryans first entered it. It will
not be necessary to set down Aryan numerals, as they
are so well known: the others which I shall notice are
these:—

	I	II	III	·IV	V.
		Finnish.			
Fin ....*yksi*		*kaksi*	*kolmi*	*neljä*	*wiisi.*
Esthonian ...*üts**		*kats†*	*kolm*	*nelli*	*wiis.*
Lapponic......*akt*		*qwekte*	*kolm*	*nelje*	*wit.*
Syrianic ......*ötik*		*kyk*	*kujm*	*njolj*	*vit.*
Hungarian ...*egy*		*kettō*	*három*	*négy‡*	*öt.*
		Basque.			
	bat	*bi*	*hirú*	*lau*	*bost.*
		Caucasian.			
Georgian......*erthi*		*oriŞ*	*sami*	*othkhi*	*khuthi.*
Tuschi ......*sha*		*śi*	*qho*	*dhew*	*phchi.*
Circassian ...*se*		*tu*	*śi*	*ptl'e*	*t'chu.*
Abkhasian ...*aka*		*vi*	*khi*	*phśi*	*chu.*
		Turkish.			
	bir	*iki*	*úć*	*dúrt*	*beś.*

---

* Genitive, *ütte.*   † Genitive, *katte.*

‡ Compare these Finnish numerals for "four" with the Tamil
nángu, nálu, "four."

§ Compare the Chinese *ár,* "two."

	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X.*
			Finnish.		
Fin ....*kuusi*	*seitsen*	*kahdeksa*	*yhdeksa*	*kymmen.*
Esthonian . *kuus*	*seitse*	*kattesa*	*üttesa*	*kümme.*
Lapponic...*kut*	*kietja*	*kaktse*	*aktse*	*lokke.*
Syrianic ...*kvajt*	*sizim*	*kôhjamys*	*ökmys*	*das.*
Hungarian.*hat*	*hét*	*nyoltz*	*kilentz*	*tiz.*
			Basque.		
	sei	*zazpi*	*zortzi*	*bederatzi*	*amár.*
			Caucasian.		
Georgian...*ekhvsi*	*śvidi*	*rva*	*≠kkra*	*athi.*
Tuschi......*yethch*	*wort*	*bart*	*iss*	*itt.*
Circassian . *chi*	*b'le*	*ga*	*bgu*	*pśe.*
Ahkhasian.*f*	*biś*	*aa*	*· ś'*	*śva.†*
			Turkish.		
	álti	*yédi*	*sčkiz*	*dókuz*	*ón.*

The first point to which I would draw attention
here is, the manner in which several of these numerals
for "eight" and "nine" are formed. It will be at
once apparent, on comparing the Fin, the Esthonian,
and the Lapponio expessions for "one" and "two,"
"nine" and "eight," that in each of the three dialects
the last element of "nine" and "eight" is the same,
while "one" is the first element of "nine," and "two"
of "eight."‡ Thus, in Esthonian, "one" is *üt(s)*, and

---

* Observe, as a basis for inquiry, that the decade comprises
only three characters, "one," "five," and "ten." The Fin *kak-*,
the Syrianic *kyk*, and the Turkish *tki*, "two," seem = *yk yk*, II.

† The non-radical Abkhasian suffix *-ba* is omitted throughout
(*ante*, p. 52).

‡ Cf. Pott, *Zählmethode*, p. 129, note.

"nine" is *ŭt-tesa;* "two" is *kat(s)*, and "eight" is *kat-tesa*. The only solution of this is, that such numerals for "eight" and "oine" are formed on the principle of the Roman IIX and IX, *duodeviginti* and *undeviginti;* ond consequently that in the Fin *-deksa*, the Esthonian *-tesa*, ond the Lopponic *-tse*, we have three forms of a word allied to tho Aryan for "ten," which is, besides, found explicitly in the Syriac *das*, "ten" (= Ossetic *das* or *däs*), and io the Hongarian *tíz*, "ten." Precisely in tho somo manner the Syrionic *kŏkjamys*, "eight," and *ŭkmys*, "nine," ore formed, and would therefore imply a word *mys* or *amys*, "ten," which the Syriac *komyn*, "thirty," *neljamyn*, "forty," and *vitymyn*, "fifty," would indicate to exist olso under the form *myn*, *amyn*, or *ymyn*. This word seems to me the Fin *kymmen* and tho Esthonian *kümme*, "ten," and may be akin to the Basqoe *amár*, "ten," which takes the form *ama* in *ama-icá*, "eleven," where *icá* would ho "one," and = Sanskrit *eka*, Abkhasian *aka*, Hungarian *egy*, etc.

The Huogorian ood Basque for "eight" and "nine" would likowise be compound terms, but of a differcnt natore. As we can hardly avoid connecting *nyol-* in the Hnngarian *nyol-tz*, "eight," with the Finnish words for "four," such as tho Syrionic *njolj* and the Lapponic *nelje*, it would follow that *nyol-tz*, "eight," most $= 4 \times 2$ (compare *quatre-vingt*), ond consequently that *-tz* is equivolcnt to *two*, *zwei*, or the Tuschi *si*, "two." In *ki-lentz*, tho Hungarion for "nine," I should conjecturo thot *lentz* is the same as *neltz* or *nyoltz*, ond that $ki\text{-}len\text{-}tz = 1 + 4 \times 2$.

The next step is to compare the Hungarian and the Basque for " eight" and " nine" :—

Hungarian.		Busque.
" Oao," *egy*,	*bat*,	1.
" Eight," *nyol-tz*,		*zor-tzi*, 4×2.
" Niae," *ki-len-tz*,		*bed-era-tzi*, $1 + 4 \times 2$.

The Huagarian and the Basque seom here to havo the same formation, but to possess oaly one element in common, which is *tz* or *tzi*, " two"; and, as the Basqae for " two" ia *bi*, which ia to ho compared with tho Latin *bi(s)* and tho Abkhasian *vi*, the Basque would apparently contain a complete form for " two" very nearly ideutical with tho German *zwei*, = Sanskrit *dvi* or *dva*. So we havo in Hindustaai, *ḍu*, " two," and *bâ*-reh, " twelve." Again, the Basque forms for " eight" and " nino," if they are composed liko the Hungarian, woald contain *zor* and *era*, " four." These elements, too, may be allied to the Aryan, as " four" is in Sanskrit *ćatvár* or *ćatur*, in Afghan *z̆alûr*, in Hindustani *ćár*, ia Armenian *ćor* and *chaṛ*, in Gorman *vier*, and in Swedish *fyra*. *R* is the letter which is retained in every Aryan form of " four."

When wo pass from the Pyrenees to tho Caucasus, and consider the Georgian for " oight" and " nine," this letter *r* immediately attracts attention. For, in the Georgian language, " oight" is *rva*, and " niae" is *z̆kh-ra*, which last form = $1 + 8$; for *z̆kh-* would = Tuschi *z̆ha*, " one," and *-ra* would = *rva*, " eight."

The comparison betwoen the Basque and Caucasian numerals for " one," " eight," and " nine," leads to these resnlts :—

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
\text{Circassian} \quad \ldots se \\
\text{Lesgi} \quad \ldots\ldots\ldots za \\
\text{Tuschi} \quad \ldots\ldots\ldots \dot{z}ha
\end{array}\right\}\text{I.}
$$

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
\text{Georgian} \ldots\ldots \quad r-va \\
\text{Suanian} \ldots\ldots \quad ar-a \\
\text{Mingrelian} \ldots \quad r-uo
\end{array}\right\}\text{VIII.}
$$

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
\text{Georgian} \ldots\ldots \dot{z}kh\text{-}r-a \\
\text{Suanian} \ldots\ldots \acute{c}kh\text{-}ar\text{-}a \\
\text{Mingrelian} \ldots \acute{c}kh\text{-}or\text{-}o
\end{array}\right\}\text{IX.}
$$

$$
\text{Basque}\ldots\ldots
\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
but, & \text{I.} \\
\quad zor\text{-}tzi, & \text{VIII.} \\
bed\text{-}era\text{-}tzi, & \text{IX.}
\end{array}\right.
$$

Using the term " Iberian" to include the Georgian, Suanian, and Mingrelian dialects, it may be said with great probability :—

I. In Iberian and in Basque, as in Hungarian, " eight" $= 4 \times 2$, and " nine" $= 1 + 4 \times 2$.

II. Of the three elements, "one," "two," and "four," which compose "eight" and "nine," "one" is different in Iberian and Basque, while " two" and " four" are the same, and are apparently Aryan as well as Basque and Caucasian : for the Caucasian r-, ar-, and or-, with the Basque zor- and era-, may all be referred to Aryan forms for " four"; and the Caucasian $-va$, $-a$, $-uo$, and $-o$, with the Basque $-tzi$, may all be brought out of such Aryan forms as dva, duo, and $zwei$. Indeed, the Aryan for " two" is explicitly found in Caucasian and Basque; as " two" is tu in Circassian, si in Tuschi, vi in Ahkhasian, and bi in Basque; so that the Georgian $-va$, " two," in " eight," is nearly Basque, and the Basque $-tzi$, " two," in " eight," is nearly Tuschi.

III. The Hungarian contains the Aryan for "two," under the form -*tz* in "eight"; and the Hungarian, with other Finnish dialects, contains the Aryan for "one" and "ten" also.

All this seoms as if there were a certain bond of connexion between the threo races that preceded tho Aryans in the West, the Basques, the Fins, and the Caucasians ; and likewise as if these three races and the Aryans had in very remote ages a common ancestry and a common home.*

There are other signs in Basque of the use of numerals which are not explicitly found in that language. Thus "après demain" is in Basquo *etzi*, which may be akin to tho Georgian *ze-g*, "après demain," where -*g* is perhaps to bo compared with the Georgian *dghe* or tho Basque *egun*, "day." Again, in Georgian, *mazeg* is "en trois jours"; and, in Basquo, *etzi-damu* is "en trois jours," and *etzi-dazu* is "en quatre jours." Here the Georgian *ma-zeg* appears to signify " one after-to-morrow," whilo the Basque *etzi-da-mu* and *etzi-da-zu* appear to signify "after-to-morrow and one," "after-to-morrow and two." If so, then *zu*, "two," is implicitly contained in Basque; and *mu*, "one," and *ma*, "ono," are implicitly contained in Basque and Georgian, and are to be compared with the Armenian *mi*, *mov*, *me-*, " one," and the Etruscan *mach*, *me-*, *muv-*, "one." *Da* means "and" in Georgian,

* The Tamil *on-badu*, IX, is formed like the Fin *yh-deksa*, "one *from* ten," out of the Tamil *onrru*, I, and *pattu*, X ; as the Tamil *aindu*, V, and *pattu*, X, coalesce into *aim-badu*, L.

as *eta, ta, enda, da,* do in Basque. *Etzi-da-mu* and
etzi-da-zu would be formed like the Basque *oguei-ta-bat,* "twenty and one," and *oguei-t(a)-amar,* "twenty
and ten, thirty." The Georgian for "thirty" is a
similar form, *ozda athi = ozi-da-athi,* "twenty and
ten." The difference between the Basque o-*guei* and
the Georgian o-*zi,* "twenty," is similar to that be-
tween the Latin vi-*ginti* and the Armenian ch-*san,*
where the Latin *g* is changed for a sibilant. Both
-*guei* and -*zi,* as well as o-, might be Aryan.

The following Aryan numerals seem thus to have
been detected in Caucasian, Basque, and Finnish :—

"Ono"—in Finnish as *yk, ki-,* and *egy ;* in Basque
as -*icá ;* in Caucasian as *aka.*

"One"—in Caucasian as *ma-;* in Basque as -*mu.*

"Two"—in Caucasian as *tu, si, vi, -va, -a, -uo,* and
-*o ;* in Basque as *bi, -tzi,* and -*zu ;* in Finnish as -*tz.*

"Four"—in Caucasian as *ar-, -or-,* and *r- ;* in
Basque as *zor-* and -*era-.*

"Ten"—in Finnish as *tiz, das, -deksa, -tesa,* and
-*tse ;* and possibly in Caucasian as -*zi* (= *tsi*), and in
Basque as -*guei.*

The analysis of numerals is worth prosecuting farther.
The most perfect Aryan form for "six" is the Zend
khsvas, otherwise written *csvas,* which would have
passed into *khvas* before it could give the Armenian
wez and the Albanian *gyaś(të).* Now *khvas* is like the
Georgian *ekhvsi,* "six," but gives no explanation of it.
If, however, we interpret *ekh-vsi* by the Finnish dia-
lects, it becomes significant. It would be *yk-wiisi,*

1 + 5, and = Fin *k-uusi*, Esthonian *k-uus*, "six"; which, with the three other Finnish forms for "six," may likewise be reduced to 1 + 5, VI. Having got thus far, let us again take up the Zend *kh-svas*, and suppose it, as well as the Ossetic *ach-säz*, "six," to be 1 + 5. In this case, *svas*, with the Sanskrit *śaś* and the Afghan *śbaź*, "six," would properly be "five"; just as the Armenian *weź*, "six," having lost the prefix implying "one," is to be compared with the Fin *wiisi*, the Lapponic *wit*, the Turkish *beś*, and the Basque *bost*, all signifying "five." In like manner, as we have seen (*ante*, p. 54), the Circassian *chi*, VI, would be the Etruscan *ki* and the Lesgi *chewa*, V; the Etruscan *huth*, IV, would be the Georgian *khuthi* and the Lazic *khut*, V; and the Ahkhasian *phśi*, IV, would be the Tuschi *phchi*, V. It seems, then, as if there were once a primeval word, *svas*, "five," which was common to Aryans and Turanians; and this word would be found in Basque with its original sense, as the second element of the Basque *zaz-pi*, VII, would be the Basque *bi*, II : for *zaz-bi* would become *zazpi*, just as *ez*, "non," and *ba*, "si," coalesce in Basque into *ezpa*, "nisi." It is evident, if *zazpi* be VII, and *pi* = *bi*, II, that *zaz* must necessarily be V, though this would have been forgotten when terms like the Sanskrit *śaś* were employed for "six." The adoption of a new term, such as *pańćan*, for "five," may have been the cause of such inaccuracy.

Signs of primeval affinity seem so remarkable here as to deserve being tabulated :—

Hebrew	........*echad,*...............		I.
Hungarian	......*egy,*		I.
Sanskrit	.........*eka,*		I.
Abkhasian	......*aka,*		I.
Chinese	....	*wù,*	V.
Lapponic......	{	*· wit,*	V.
	k——*ut,*	......	VI.
Esthonian ...	{	*wiis,*......	V.
	k——*uus,*	......	VI.
Georgian	.........*ekh*——*vsi,*	......	VI.
Armenian	......	*weï,*	VI.
Ossetic	...........*ach*——*sāz,*	......	VI.
Basque.........	{	*bi,*	II.
	zoz——*pi,*	VII.
Hebrew	....	*šéš,*	VI.
Sanskrit	....	*šaš,*	VI.
Zend	...........*kh*——*svas,*......		VI.
Afghan	....	*šbaż*	VI.
Turkish	....	*beš,*	V.
Basque	....	*bost,*	V.

Have we any indications of what this supposed primeval word for "five" may have been? There cannot be much doubt about the most probable meaning for such a word. This meaning is "hand": and the apparent affinity between such words as the Persian *panj,* "five," and *panč,* "fist," has been noticed by several writers. The Basque *bost,* "five," might thus be related to the Slavonic *pjast,* "pugnus," and to the German *faust* and the English *fist;* all which words have nearly the termination of the Zend *zasta,*

Sanskrit *hasta*, "hand." So too the Turkish *beś*, "five," which seems akin to the Basque *bost*, "five," resembles the Gaelic *bas*, *bos*, "the palm of the hand," which is the same word as the Welsh *bys* and the Breton *bez*, "finger"; terms capable, like the Armenian *boyth*, "thumb," = Welsh *bawd*, of explaining the Basque *bat*, "one," and perhaps the Turkish *bir*, "one." In like manner, we might pass from the Tuschi *bui*, "fist," to the Chinese *wù*, "five." It may, too, be possible that both the Turkish *beś* and the Basque *bost*, "five," are originally allied to the Afghan *śbaž*, "six" (properly "five"), and to the supposed primitive *svas*, "hand." At any rate, a word like *svas*, "hand," seems contained in many languages of different families. It may emerge in the Armenian *thath*, "hand, fist"; in the Tuschi *tot*, "hand"; in the Egyptian *toot*, "hand"; in the Gaelic *dòid*, "hand"; and again in the Armenian *thiz*, "a span," *thēz-ovk*, "a pygmy." It may be seen (*ante*, p. 105) how *sós* = *thóth* in Armenian. *Svas* may also appear, and in a form more like itself, in the Persian *sáž*, "make"; in the Armenian *śóś(aphel)*, "to handle"; in the Phrygian *sos(esait)*, "he makes"; and in the Gaelic *sàs*, "lay hold of." A similar word might be discerned in the Basque *escú*, the Suanian *śi*, and the Chinese *śeù*, all signifying "hand": and even the Esthonian *kässi* and the Lapponic *kät*, "hand," the Lesgi *koda*, "hand," the Ossetic *koch*, *kuch*, "hand," *kach*, "foot" (cf. Armenian *kach*-avel, "to dance," and English *kick*), and the Tuschi *k'hak*, "hoof," may bear some

signs of an original likeness to *svas*, which has become the Welsh *chwech*, "six, ἕξ." The Lapponic *kät*, the Lesgi *koda*, and the Ossetic *kuch*, "hand," would help to explain the Georgian *khuthi*, "five," like as the Georgian *phekhi*, "foot," is apparently identical with the Tuschi *phchi*, "five." The Circassian *t'chu*, "five," and *pśe*, "ten," seem allied to *khuthi* and *phchi*; and if so, then the Circassian *pśe* would be "feet," as the Abkhasian *śva*, "ten," might be "hands." Reckoning by scores originated, most probably, in men once counting with their feet as well as their hands. Both Caucasians and Basques reckon by scores: thus "forty" is "twice twenty," and so on. The apparent identity of the Abkhasian *śva*, "ten," with the Basque *zaz-*, "five," in *zazpi*, "seven"; and of the Georgian *phekhi*, "foot," with the Tuschi *phchi*, "five," the Abkhasian *phśi*, "four" (properly "five"), and the Circassian *pśe*, "ten";—this shews how "ten" may be the plural of "five," and thus be nearly the same word. We may consequently compare the Tuschi *itt*, the Lazic *wit*, the Mingrelian *withi*, and the Georgian *athi*, all meaning "ten," with such Finnish words for "five" as the Lapponic *wit* and the Hungarian *öt*. The Finnish words might originally signify "hand" or "foot," and the Caucasian words, "hands" or "feet."

The five Finnish expressions for "six," *kuusi*, *kuus*, *kut*, *kvajt*, and *hat*, are all alike, and all probably = 1 + 5. But, in the expressions for "seven," a difference is discernible. The Lapponic *kietja* and the Hungarian *hét*, "seven," may = 6 + 1; but the Fin

scitsen, the Esthonian *seitse*, and the Syrianic *sizim*, " seven," seem differently composed, and bear a likeness to the Georgian and the Basque for " seven":—*

> Fin ....*sei-tse(n)*.
> Esthoaian ...*sci-tse*.
> Syrianic ......*si-zi(m)*.
> Georgian ......*śvi-di*.
> Mingrelian ...*sqwi-thi*.
> Basque........*zaz-pi* (= *zaz-bi*, 5 + 2).

There is no objection to making *sei-* = *si-* = *śvi-* = *zaz-*, as *se-decim* = *sex-decem*, and *śo-daçan* = *śaś-daçan*. Similar instances of elision may perhaps be foaad in the Hebrew *śeś*, *śe-ba'*, and *śē-móneh*, " six," " seven," and " eight."†

Svas, "hand," especially as we have also the Basque *escú* and the Suanian *śi*, "hand," as well as the Abkhasian *śva*, "ten," i. e. "fives" or " hands," will thus bring together the Basque *zaz-* (which is nearly *sras*), and the Georgian *śvi-* (which preserves the *v* of *svas*, and is like the Abkhasian *śva*), and the Mingrelian *sqwi-* (which approaches to the Basque *escú*), and the Syrianic *si-* and the Fia *sei-* (which resemble the Suanian *śi*). In like manaer, the Aryan *dva*, *dvi*, *zwei*, *bi(s)*, and δί(ς), with the Tuschi *śi* and the Abkhasian *vi*, "two," will explain the Basque *-pi* (= *bi*), and the Mingrelian *-thi*, and the Georgian *-di*,

---

* It is worth noticing, by the way, that *scitse-n* and *sizi-m* have terminations like the Aryan *sapta-n* and *septe-m*.

† *-mónsh* seems allied to *mánsh*, "part, number," and *mónsh*, "part, time." " Parts" imply duality at the least.

and the Syrianic *-zi*, and the Fin *-tse;* which last two
forms would thus = the Hungarian *-tz* in *nyol-tz,*
4 × 2, and *ki-len-tz,* 1 + 4 × 2, as well as the Basque
-tzi in the similarly composed numerals, *zor-tzi* and
*bed-era-tzi.** The Abkhasian *bi-š,* " seven," may con-
tain the elements, *bi,* "two," and *š,* "five," = Suanian
ši, "hand." In the Georgian, Abkhasian, and Basque,
and in the three Finnish dialects, the Syrianic, the
Esthonian, and the Fin Proper, there would conse-
quently appear to be a similar combination of the
same two elements in the number VII; and these
elements would belong to the ancestors of the Aryans,
as well as to the ancestors of the Fins, the Caucasians,
and the Basques. These last three families or nations
would, moreover, when they formed their " seven,"
have used *svas* rightly, as " five," not as " six." This
cannot be said of the Aryans: for if the Sanskrit
sa-pta(n) is connected with *šaš* (which may possibly
be the case, though the Zend *khsvas* and *haptan* seem

---

* The explanation of the Finnish *sei-tse,* "seven," as 6 + 1,
from such forms as the Basque *sei,* "six," and the Circassian *se,*
"one," might be possible, but would hardly be probable. In
another Finnish dialect, the Ostiak, *ki* is II (= Syrianic *kyk*),
vet is V (= Syrianic *vit*), and *ta-vet* is VII, i. e. *ta* + V. There-
fore *ta* is II, as well as *ki,* which is used *subtractively,* as in *kyt,*
III, i. e. *ki,* II, from *vet,* V. *Ta-vet,* VII, is thus formed out of
the same elements as the other Finnish, the Caucasian, and the
Basque terms for VII (p. 141); elements that are Aryan as well as
Turanian. The Ostiak *kyda,* VI, seems = *kyt-da* (= *ta*), 3 × 2;
as *nida,* VIII, would be *net-da,* 4 × 2, like the Hungarian *nyoltz,*
the Basque *zortzi,* and the Georgian *rva.* The Ostiak *net,* IV,
seems = "one from five (*vet*)," as the Tamil *nángu,* IV, seems
= " one from five (*aindu*)."

against such a supposition), yet we could not well get "two" out of -*pta*.* If "two" is found at all in coalition with *śaś*, it would rather be in *aś-ṭa(n)* or *aś-ṭáu*, "eight." *Aś* is "six" in Lazic, and *sa* is "six" in (Pelasgic) Etruscan. As in the Georgian and Basque pronouns, so too in the formation of the Georgian and Basque for "seven," an affinity to the language which was becoming Aryan would appear, though the three forms of speech became afterwards very distinct.†

It may have been observed that Finnish dialects

---

* Compare the Circassian *pt-l'e*, "four," which seems = "*one from five*," IV. The Aryan numerals for "three," "four," "seven," and "eight," are not easily explained. "Fonr" is perhaps the most difficult.

† Dr. Latham, in his *Varieties of Man* (p. 127), gives the word *khut*, "hand," as used in the Manipur and Khoibu languages in Upper Birmah; and he compares it with the Lesgi *koda*, "hand." It is still nearer to the Georgian *khuthi* and the Lazic *khut*, "five," and to the Pelasgic Etruscan *huth*, "four." *Svas*, "hand, five," does not appear to be confined to the Old World, for I find in the same work the following Natchez words:—

> *i-spesh-e*, "hand."
> *shped-ee*, "five"

Spesh and *shped* may = *svas*, as Armenian *spit*-ak = Sanskrit *çvet-a* = English *whit-e* = German *weiss*; analogies which shew how the Natchez *shpedee*, the Lapponic *wit*, and the Fin *wiisi*, all meaning "five," may be originally the same word. Compare also *ispeshe*, "hand," with the Sanskrit *spaç*, "facere," and the Gaelic *spâg*, "paw." Again, "hand" is *shag*-ai in Omahaw, and *shak*-e in Mohawk; and "foot" is *see* and *seeh*-ah in Sioux, and a-*shoo* in Pawnee. *Su* is "foot" in Chinese. At Norton Sound, near Behring's Straits, "hand" is ai-*shet*, "nails" are *shet*-ooe, and "fonr" is *shet*-amik. We may have here, and in the words cited in the text (*ante*, p. 139), different forms of one of the primitive words of the human race, and a sign of its original unity.

employ in composition a different word for "ten" than their own (p. 132). So does the Etruscan in *-lchl*, "-genti," = *lch-lch*, 10 × 10. So does the Lithuanian in *-lika*, "-teen," = Polish *lik*, "number." And so, too, does the English in *e-leven* and *twe-lve*, tho Gothic *ainlif* and *twalif*. Grimm agrees with Bopp in regarding *-lif* (and *-lika*) as forms of a primeval word for "ten," *einer uralten zehnzahl*. This word seems to be found, and in our English form *-leven* too, in the Malay *sa-lapan*, "nine," and *du-lapan*, "eight"; words which contain tho Malay *sa*, "one" (cf. Circassian *se*, Lesgi *za*, Tuschi *zha*, "one"), and *duwa*, "two" (a perfect Aryan form like tho Afghan *duva*), and are evidently constructed just like the Fin *yh-deksa*, "nine," and *kah-deksa*, "eight," IX and IIX. As tho Malay is thus connected in some points with more western and northern languages, it is possible that it may be so in other points, and thus be allowably employed in tho explanation of such languages. Now the Malay for "five" is *lima*. Prefix to this tho *kah*, "two," of the Fin *kah-deksa*, "eight," = 2 from 10, and we should obtain *kah-lima*, 2 from 5, "three," which might be contracted into tho Fin *kolmi* and the Lapponic *kolm*, "three," nearly as *two-leve* becomes *twelve* in English. Tho Finnish words for "four," such as the Esthonian *n-elli*, may mean "1 from 5," IV, and be allied to the Turkish *ál-ti*, "six," *élli*, "fifty," and *él*, "hand." If the Etruscan *za-l* and the Georgian *sa-mi*, "three," are allied to the Fin *ko-lmi*, and thus imply *sa-lmi* as a more perfect form, then *za* and *sa* would bo "two,"

like the Tuschi *śi* and the German *zwei*. Compare also the Javanese *tâ-lu*, "three." At any rate, since there are several ways, as will be more completely shewn directly, of making *-l* = "five," the Etruscan *za-* in *za-l* would most likely be "two," and thus = Georgian *sa-*; for it seems that the Georgian *sa-mi* = Mingrelian *su-mi* = Lazie *ǵu-m* = Syrianic *ku-jm* = Lapponic *ko-lm*, "three," i. e. "*two* from five." And thus the composition and the first elements of the Etruscan *za-l* and the Georgian *sa-mi*, "three," would apparently be the same, whatever may be thought of their second elements. If *t* be "five" in the Tuschi *wor-t*, "seven," and *ba-r-t*, "eight," then *wor-* and *-r-* would be "two," = Georgian *ori*, = Chinese *ár;* while *ba-* would be "one," and probably allied to the Basque *bat*, "one," and possibly to the Hebrew *-ba'* in *śe-ba'*, "seven." As the Tuschi *ba-rt*, "eight," seems = 1 + *wort*, "seven," so the Circassian *b-gu*, "nine," may = 1 + *ga*, "eight," as the Georgian *źkh-ra*, "nine," = 1 + *rva*, "eight." It is difficult to guess what the Circassian *gu* or *ga*, "eight," may have been originally; but, if we were to combine it with the Georgian *rva* and *ra*, "eight," we might get *g-r*, "four," and *ua* or *va*, "two." The Circassian would, however, in such a case, want the characteristic letter *r* of the Aryan "four"; and the Abkhasian *a-a*, "eight," if = 4 × 2, would have suffered still more than the Circassian *g-a.*

It may be as well to tabulate for the second, or *l* "five," as I have done for the first (*ante*, p. 138) :—

Welsh	{ *bys,* .... "finger."
	llaw, "hand."
Breton............	*bez,* .... "finger."
Cornish	*lau,* "hand."
Armenian	*boyth,* .... "thumb."
Turkish	*él,* "hand."
Malay .... {	*lima,* "hand."
	lima, v.
Basque ...... {	*bat,* .... I.
	bi, ... II.
Tuschi	*śi,* .... II.
Georgian.........	*ori,*........ II.
Chinese	*âr,*........ II.
Fin	*ko — lmi,* IIV (*ko-* = "two").
Syrianic	*ku — jm,* IIV.
Lazic	*ǵu — m,* IIV.
Mingrelian	*su — mi,* IIV.
Georgian.........	*sa — mi,* IIV.
Etruscan	*za — l,* IIV.
Javanese.........	*tâ — lu,* IIV.
Circassian	*pt———l'e,* IV.
Esthonian	*ne———lli,* IV (*ne-* = "ono").*
Syrianic	*nju———lj,* IV.
Basque	*lau,* IV ("one" lost).
Circassian	*b'——le,* VII.
Tuschi .... {	*wor—t,* VII.
	ba———r———t, VIII.

The Abkhasian *bi-ś* and the Circassian *b'-le,* "seven,"

---

* See also note (*ante,* p. 142), and compare Tamil *nâlu,* IV (*ante,* p. 130, note). *Nyë is* "one" in Albanian.

appear similar forms, with the same "two," and a
different "five." $Bi-s = 2 + 5$, as the Basque *zaz-pi*
and the Georgian *śvi-di* $= 5 + 2$. The Malay *lima*,
"five," is evidently the *lima*, "hand, arm," of the
islets between Timor and Papua.* Like the former
word for "five, hand," this second word seems to stretch
across Europe and Asia. For, as the Basque *escú*
would be the Suanian *śi* and the Chinese *śeü*, all
meaning "hand" (as the English *skew* and *shy* are the
German *scheu*), so the Malay *lima*, "hand," "five,"
and *-lapan*, "ten," are to be compared with the
following words cited by Diefenbach (*Lex. Comp.* s. v.
lofa) : Gothic *lofa*, "the open hand," $=$ Scotch *loof*;
Gaelic *làmh*, Welsh *llaw*, "hand"; Cornish *lof, lau*,
"hand"; Gaelic *lapadh*, "paw"; Polish *łapa*, "paw";
Lapponic *lapa*, "the sole of the foot." The same
root would also be found in the Welsh *llam*, "stride,
step," and in the German *lauf* and the English *leap*;
as well as, probably, in the Tuschi *lap*, "step, stair,
treppe," and *lam*, "mountain." By a similar associa-
tion of ideas, we may connect together the Tuschi *it*,
"run," and *itt*, "ten"; and might detect *svas* in the
Hebrew *śûś, śûs,* "rejoice, leap" (cf. Polish *sus*, "hüpfen"),
sûs, "horse," and *sâs*, "moth," $= σής$. *Svas* might
also supply the thema for the Armenian *sôs-* or *thôth-*,
śovth- and *kach-*, as well as for *śóś-* (p. 105). Of the
three characters which compose the decade, I, V, X,

* Crawfurd's *Malay Grammar and Dictionary*, vol. i, p. xcviii.
Cf. Pott, *Zählmethode*, p. 121.

the most likely meaning for I is "finger"; for V, "hand"; and for X, "hands" or "fingers" collectively. The English *ten*, *-teen*, as the German *zehn* and *zehen* intimate, is "toes," i. e. "fingers";* and *-leven* would probably be "hands." The resemblance which the Circassian *se*, Lesgi *za*, Tuschi *zha*, "one," bear to the German *zehe*, *zeig-*, and *zeich-*, or to the Basque *atz*, "finger," should perhaps not be passed unnoticed.

The Polynesian dialects are connected with the Malay family. The following numerals are used in Hawaii and Tahiti† :—

	I	II	III	IV	V.
Hawaii...*akahi*	*arua*	*akoru*	*ahaa*	*arima*.
Tahiti ...*atahi*	*arua*	*atoru*	*amaha*	*arima*.

	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X.
Hawaii...*aono*	*ahitu*	*avaru*	*aiva*	*umi*.
Tahiti ...*aono*	*ahitu*	*avaru*	*aiva*	*ahuru*.

Rima means "hand, arm," in Hawaii, just as *lima* does in Malay; and thus explains the Polynesian *arima*, "five," as the Malay *lima*, "hand, arm," does the Malay *lima*, "five." The Polynesian initial *a* seems superfluous. There is a similar conversion of *l* into *r* in the Finnish dialects, where the Esthonian and Lapponic *kolm*, "three," becomes the Hungarian *három*, "three," which may enable us to pass to the Basque

---

* "Noch unleugbarer stehn δάκτυλος, *digitus* und *zeha* (digitus pedis) mit δέκα, *decem*, δείκνυμι und *zeigen* in zusammenhang."— Grimm, *Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache*, p. 244.

† These islands are separated by 2500 miles of sea.

hirú, "three." Compare, too, the Hindustani so-*leh,* "sixteen," and set-*reh,* "seventeen."* The Polynesian words for "three" are plainly "1 to 2," and not "2 from 5" like the Finnish. The Hawaiian *umi,* "ten," resembles the Fin *kymmen* and the Esthonian *kümme,* "ten," as well as the Basque *amár* or *ama,* "ten." The Polynesian *arua,* "two," is rather like the Georgian *ori* and the Chinese *ár,* "two"; and the Polynesian *ava-ru,* "eight," might possibly be compared with the Georgian *r-va,* "eight," supposing the two elements reversed, as well as with the kindred Suanian and Mingrelian terms for "eight," *ara* and *ruo.* The Lazic *ovro,* "eight," is still nearer to *avaru.* Such resemblances should be mentioned, though I hold to the former explanation of *rva, ara,* and *ruo* (*ante,* p. 134). *Avaru* seems $= 4 \times 2,$ and is thus apparently composed like the Hungarian and Basque for "eight," though with different elements.†

---

* *L* is always represented by *r* in Zend. The city of *Lima* in Peru is so called from the river *Rimac.*

† The Malay *laki,* "man, husband," may be compared with the following words:—Circassian *lay,* "flesh"; *lay, t'hlay,* "blood"; *tlay,* "husband";—Ossetic *lag,* "man"; *lappu, latu,* "lad";—Lesgi *les,* "man"; *less,* "husband"; *il'yadi,* "wife";—Lycian *lads,* "wife"; —Abkhasian *lkhadza,* "husband";—Esthonian *laps, lats,* "child." The Caucasian *Leges* and *Lazi* of antiquity were probably the "men." *Olaks* means "man" in the Arawak dialect of Guiana, which supplies an example of "numeration of the rudest kind," where *kabo* is like the Tamil *kai,* "hand." See also p. 139.

  Aba da kabo = "once my hand," = *five.*
  Biama da kabo = "twice my hand," = *ten.*
  Aba olaks = "one man," = *twenty.*
    (Latham, *Ethnology of the British Colonies,* p. 260).

With regard to the symbols, I, V, X, "the digit," "the hand," and "the hands" or "the fingers," I would represent accurately enough the extended finger, and V the angular space between the thumb and the forefinger when the hand is held up. This angular space is called in Armenian *chil*, which is like the Georgian *kheli* or *qheli*, "hand"; hoth which terms might contain the Etruscan or Pelasgian *ki*, "five," with the addition in one case of the Etruscan and Armenian termination -*il*, and in the other of the Georgian termination -*eli*. X would he the figure formed by placing the two hands across one another. The Chinese character for "ten" is a cross, which is called *ši*, as "hand" is called *šeù* in Chinese, and *ši* in Suanian, and as "ten" is *šva* in Ahkhasian.

The results of the previous analysis of numerals are to he taken in conjunction with what seems to follow from the numbers on the Etruscan dice, namely, that the *Pelasgic* Etruscan numerals were Caucasian. See especially the tabular view (*ante*, p. 54). The inferences which I should be inclined to draw from the numerals, as well as from conjugations and pronouns, have been already explained in my first chapter, where I have hrought together several other coincidences of different kinds, which appear hy their comhined force to conduct us to a similar conclusion. And this conclusion would ho:—that hefore the Aryans hegan to spread from their original home, they dwelt there with Fins and Caucasians on their west; the

Caucasians tending towards the south, and the Fins towards the north: and that as the Fins scattered themselves, speaking in a general manner, over the northern half of Europe, the Caucasians did the same over the southern half, but probably at an earlier period; for the Caucasians, especially if it were allowable to include the Basques among them, cannot be said to have developed a common numeral system before dispersion, while the Fins would have done so, though not quite as perfectly as the Aryans. Both of the Turanian races would have been continually impelled farther westward, as the Dravidas would have been southward, by the expansion of the Aryans, who ultimately broke through the Western Turanians by two different routes, one on each side of the Euxine, and gradually encroached upon them till they were left as they now are, in the Caucasus, and the Pyrenees, and the North of Sweden and Russia, though their ancient presence in the heart of Europe is still indicated by two or three words used in the Alps. When Livy attributed Etruscan affinities to the Alpine population in general, but especially to the Rhætians, he probably spoke with more accuracy than has been generally thought, or even perhaps than he himself was aware of. For all, or nearly all, the original inhabitants of the Alps (as well as of the pile-dwellings on the Swiss lakes) may have been *Tuscan*, i.e. Caucasian, while the Aryan *Rasenæ* penetrated no farther to the west than Rhætia, and a subsequent Celtic inroad made the Aryan population of Noricum quite as much Celtic as

Thracian.   In Armenia and the Caucasus, Asia may
thus claim both elements of the Etruscan people as her
own, whether they were of Tyrrhenian or of Pelasgian
origin.   Such, at least, is the hypothesis which seems
to explain all the evidence that I have brought forward,
and to solve at the same time four ethnological pro-
blems.   In ancient ethnology, we are led to ask, who
were the Etruscans, and who were the Pelasgians?
and, in modern ethnology, what has become of the
two races of which the Armenians and the Caucasians
are the surviving representatives?   Each pair of ques-
tions supplies the answer to the other pair.

INDEX OF ETRUSCAN WORDS.

M

THE END.